

ROMAN RELIGION



FRANZ ALTHEIM

BERSERKER

BOOKS



A HISTORY OF ROMAN RELIGION

by

FRANZ ALTHEIM

PROFESSOR OF CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF FRANKFURT-AM-MAIN;
MEMBRO ORDINARIO DELL' ISTITUTO DI STUDI ETRUSCHI, FLORENCE;
HONORARY MEMBER OF PARTHENON, BUDAPEST; KORRESP. MITGLIED DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOL. INSTITUTS

Translated by

HAROLD MATTINGLY



METHUEN & CO. LTD. LONDON

36 Essex Street, Strand W.C.2

First published in 1938

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

HAROLD MATTINGLY

in Dankbarkeit und Verehrung

PREFACE

THE present volume represents an enlarged edition of my book that appeared under the same title in German. Of the sections added, some have already been published in periodicals, others appear now for the first time.

The German version on its publication met with warm welcome and equally energetic opposition. I see no occasion to withdraw my former views, but I have called attention to contrary opinions, as far as seemed feasible, in the notes. Among the expressions of criticism, those of G. Rohde and H. J. Rose seem to me the most valuable, both where they agree and where they disagree with me; a general reference to them may be made at the outset.

I much regret that K. Kerényi's *Apollon* (Vienna, 1937) and C. Koch's *Der römische Jupiter* (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1937, see below, p. 240 f.) were not out in time for me to use. Again, in the case of A. Alföldi's *An Isis festival in Rome under the Christian Emperors* (Budapest and Leipzig, 1937), I was unable to quote as fully as I could have wished. In general, scant attention has been paid to the religion of the post-Augustan age. I hope to return in a special study to this field of immense promise, which has so far been exclusively treated from the angle of ruler-cult. M. Guarducci's paper in *Studi e Materiali di storia delle religioni* 12, 25 f., is only known to me from the review in the *Amer. Journ. of Archaeology* 1937, pp. 130 ff.

The study of Italian rock-sculptures has in the last

year entered on entirely new paths. The researches of A. von Salis (*Sitz. Ber. Heidelb. Akad.* 1937) have, it is true, reinforced and extended what is said here on the Novilara Stelai. But, on the other hand, the present author himself (with E. Trautmann—*Welt als Geschichte*, 3, 83 f.) has proposed a theory of the rock-pictures of Val Camonica, which diverges appreciably from the older theory, represented in this book.

E. S. G. Robinson, Deputy-Keeper of the Department of Coins and Medals in the British Museum, has very kindly read through the whole book in proof and contributed many valuable suggestions.

To Harold Mattingly, who has kindly undertaken the task of translation, this book owes far more than is ordinarily due to a translator. To him, then, be it dedicated!

FRANZ ALTHEIM

Val Camonica, end of August, 1937

CONTENTS

BOOK I

ANCIENT ITALY

INTRODUCTION	3
CHAP.	PAGE
I THE FORCES OF EARLY ITALIAN HISTORY	7
(a) Italy as Unity	7
(b) Forms of the Ancient Mediterranean Civilization	19
1. Malta	21
2. Sardinia	23
3. The Cultures of the Rock Sculptures	29
(c) The Beginning of Greek Influence	34
II ITALY APART FROM ROME	46
(a) The Etruscan Problem	46
(b) The Italian Bull-god	64
(c) The Picture of Womanhood	81

BOOK II

ANCIENT ROME

I THE BEGINNINGS OF THE CITY OF ROME	93
1. The Cremating People	93
2. The Inhumating People. Harmonization of Rites on the Site of Rome	96
3. The Intrusion of Etruscan Civilization	100
II THE EARLIEST CALENDAR OF FESTIVALS	104
1. The Tradition	104
2. The Question of the <i>di indigites</i>	106
3. Etruscan Deities	114
4. Greek Deities	119
5. Calendar and History of the City	129
III THE ORIGIN OF THE EARLIEST CIRCLE OF GODS	135
1. The Deities of the Oldest Roman Settlements	136
2. The Reception of the Etruscan Deities	144
3. The Reception of the Greek Deities	149
IV RELIGION OF ROME AND EARLY ITALY	156

CHAP.	PAGE
V THE ROMAN FORM	171
1. The Kingship	171
2. The Conception of Deity in Early Rome	181
VI THE AGE OF ROMAN MYTH	200
1. General Remarks	200
2. Faunus and Daunus	206

BOOK III

THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

I INTRODUCTION	221
II THE RESHAPING OF CULT	224
1. Preliminary Stages in the Earliest Cult	226
2. The Capitoline Temple and its Importance	231
III FRESH INFLUX OF GREEK CULTS	243
1. Juturna and Hercules	243
2. The Reception of the Homeric Deities	247
3. The Greek Right of Asylum. The Influence of Delphi.	255
IV ITALY AND ROME	267
1. The Fall of Ancient Italian Culture	271
2. The Racial Cultures. The Rise of Rome	277
V THE INTRUSION OF HELLENISM	286
1. Influences from Southern Italy	286
2. Roman Individual Form	294
3. The Dream of Ennius	300
4. The East	309

BOOK IV

THE AUGUSTAN AGE

I INTRODUCTION	321
II THE ADVENT OF THE NEW AGE	327
1. The End of the Republic	327
2. Virgil's First Eclogue	339
III AUGUSTUS	350
IV THE RELIGION OF THE AGE OF AUGUSTUS	369
V POETRY AND CULT: THE SECULAR HYMN OF HORACE	394

BOOK V
THE EMPIRE

CHAP.	PAGE
I THE CAUSES OF THE GREATNESS OF ROME	411
II THE FIRST TWO CENTURIES OF THE EMPIRE	438
III THE AGE OF THE SEVERI	455
IV THE END	466
NOTES	475
INDEX TO SUBJECTS	541
INDEX OF PROPER NAMES	545

Book I

ANCIENT ITALY

INTRODUCTION

THE title of this book is *A History of Roman Religion*, not *Roman Religion* or *Religion and Cult of the Romans*, as G. Wissowa entitled his famous epoch-making work.¹ This implies that from the outset my theme is subject to a particular limitation. My business is not with what one might call the system of Roman religion—with the rich complex of all those conceptions that meet us in cult and saga, in the forms of the divine world and in the order to which their servants are submitted. What I am concerned to do is to assign to Roman religion its place in the historical development of Rome.

Any setting of limits within a living whole is arbitrary, but it is none the less necessary. It may only be demanded that the part delimited should be held together by its relation to a definite conception. A *history* of Roman religion, as a special subject of study, can only be orientated by a history of Rome in general. It can only be understood as a part of a coherent whole, which, regarded from another standpoint, presents itself to us as the history of Roman literature, of Roman art, of Roman law, and which, like every history, has its focus in the history of the state.

It is undeniable that the history of ancient religion invites us most urgently to regard it from this angle. Since the time that the religion which raises the claim to be the universal religion appeared on earth, a certain antagonism between religion and state has been unmistakable. The state, above all, the national state, strives to realize its particular ideas; the church, on the other hand, is from the outset directed towards a principle, which stands above all national barriers. This antagonism, which runs through all our Western history, is in ancient times absent. Till the appearance of Christianity the histories of states and religions

run on parallel lines. Both are intimately connected and mutually condition their historical form.

It was a happy stroke, then, when Mommsen and Wissowa after him placed the state religion of Rome in the centre of their view and subordinated the private cults to it. Here, if anywhere in this field, Mommsen revealed his eye for the essential. But whereas Mommsen, in this epoch, that has first to occupy us, the epoch of the early religion of Rome, kept his eyes fixed on the whole of Italy, his successor took a step which was bound to lead to the isolation of Rome from the rest, in which Rome is by nature and history included.

Wissowa, of set purpose, discarded more or less completely from his survey the religious history of the Italian peoples. In this, too, some have wished to see a lucky stroke. That might be admitted as long as it was a case of establishing certain main factors and fundamental conceptions; a simplification of the problems with reference to the special conditions of Rome might then appear an inevitable requirement. But every particular bears in itself the reference to a general context. And so the history of Rome of necessity points beyond itself to the history of ancient Italy and of the ancient Mediterranean as a whole.

If this principle has long been admitted, or rather has never been ultimately questioned, for political history, it must equally hold good for the history of religion. That the process of isolation undertaken by Wissowa was only an artificial one, and could therefore only remain provisionally, should never have been lost from view. Patiently endured for decades, it is becoming intolerable at a time when a comprehensive picture of Italian culture and history is beginning to rise before our eyes.

It is the excavations undertaken on the grand scale in Italy, particularly in the years since the War, that have given to us again that picture of a lost world. We are thinking less of the excavations which are still being zealously pursued in Pompeii of the late Republic and early Empire, or those of Ostia, which have given us a new Pompeii, but this time on the scale of a great city. What we have in view is another realm—the culture of all Italy before Rome and outside Rome.

We must remind our readers in the first place of the wealth of new knowledge which we owe to the inexhaustible soil of Etruria. The excavations of Mengarelli in the cemetery of Caere, of Minto in Populonia, the discoveries of Giglioli in ancient Veii (including the remains of the famous Apollo group), in Falerii, Orvieto, Marsiliana d'Albegna to name only a few—are in the centre of the picture. By the side of Etruria with its highly developed civilization, Sardinia has taken its place as a mighty riddle. It is not yet possible to link it up to the development of ancient Italy, but that from here in particular important discoveries are still to be expected will certainly prove true. A third great circle is represented by the Oscan-Campanian civilization and, on the other side of the peninsula, by the Illyrian tribes of Apulia. With these is associated that other Illyrian folk, the Veneti, where Este represents the centre of activity in excavation, and where in Comacchio we may presume to recognize the cemetery of the famous harbour founded by the Etruscans at Spina. In immediate association with these we find the Novilara civilization and the Euganean pictures chiselled in the rock. Finally we must remember the untiring activity of that prince of Italian excavators, Paolo Orsi. It is through him that not only hellenized Sicily and Magna Graecia, but also the native civilization of these regions has come within our field of vision.

Hand in hand with the discoveries of archaeology has gone the research into the languages of ancient Italy and their monumental remains. In the field of Oscan and Umbrian, it is true, there has been comparative inactivity, since first the foundations were laid by the investigations of the young Mommsen and of Bücheler. Work has been more vigorously concentrated on the Etruscan language, starting with the decisive researches of W. Schulze.² Ligurian in North-west Italy, Sicel, the language of the Novilara inscriptions in Picenum, have given much material for research, but it is our knowledge above all of the Illyrian tongues of Italy, Messapian and Venetian, that has in the last few years succeeded in registering a notable advance.

It must be obvious that with this resurrection of ancient Italy a wider frame is given us, in which Roman civilization

must be set. In the field of language and archaeology the attempt has already been long in progress, to grasp the position of the Roman element in its relation to the whole field. It is here that the history of Roman religion likewise must begin.

Up to now we have not got beyond first essays.³ The starting-point as a rule has been from definite single subjects, deities or cult-institutions; their peculiar character, their special form has formed the centre of discussion. But, while questions were being asked about them, the question of their provenance and origin was bound to be asked simultaneously. The historical discussions did indeed remain linked to the single case in question and could, therefore, hint at a general historical view rather than actually lead up to it. What was only given in fragments in those essays is to be set in place now in a wider context.

There can be no question of anything but an attempt. For a historical representation in the fuller sense the subject is not yet ripe. What has appeared to me clear is given in the following chapters; they represent a series of studies or a summarization of such studies, published elsewhere. Further than this we cannot yet go. The wealth of conclusions and problems that of late have been pressing in upon us demands a new and systematic treatment of the whole field. Any attempt to write a history of Roman religion will for long remain provisional. This is peculiarly true of the following sketch, which must necessarily be restricted to general indications.

Chapter I

THE FORCES OF EARLY ITALIAN HISTORY

(a) ITALY AS UNITY

TO Italy, as to few other lands, it seems to have been granted to form a geographical unit. The sharpness and definiteness of its frontiers makes us involuntarily transfer the same conceptions to all else that concerns it. And yet when this much is said, we have really said very little about its interior form. It is just here that Italy is the land of supreme contrasts.

Strictly speaking, Italy shares no less in the subtropical zone than in the regions of eternal snow—nay, more, even within those limits deep differences confront one another within the narrowest bounds. Criss-crossed by canals and tributaries, bursting with lush vegetation and fruitful greenery, filled with a damp mist and fading into the dim twilight of the far horizon of the sea, the levels of Venetia spread before our eyes. It is indeed a whole world apart from the dry and dusty chalk plain of Apulia or from the scorched steppe of the sulphur region of Sicily. But to the north of Italy belongs no less the country of the Ligurian coast : a rocky fortress, withered brown, with hill-forts and cities, a niggardly vegetation, but full of a dazzling brilliance, which sharpens the farthest contours and lights up the sea far and wide in its silver blue.

Nor are contrasts of this kind restricted to a single field. The climate of Italy is subject to variations so sharp that the terebinths, which in the south count among the evergreens, in the farthest north shed their leaves in winter. The olive, which only meets you occasionally as you come in from the Alps, begins from Bologna and Florence to define more and more the character of the country ; as you go farther, you meet to-day the fruits of tropical origin,

oranges and lemons. Or take the conformation of the land ; here too the chains of the central range of mountains separate the east of the peninsula from the west, as well as part of the east from the region flooded by the Po ; that region—the rump of Italy—forms in natural configuration no less than in climate a region by itself.

What is true of the land is no less true of its inhabitants. It is astonishing how many are the peoples, who in the course of ages have established themselves here and there on the soil of Italy. Differing not only in origin and essence, but in the measure of their diffusion, they have all left behind them their traces in one or other form. Greeks and Phœnicians, Celts and Etruscans, Arabs and Byzantines, Romanic peoples of the adjacent lands, one and all can claim a share in the history and population of Italy.

The great variety of racial stratification runs parallel to the geographical distinctions. Taken together these two will explain why it has always needed a decided, clear and resolute will, to unite all the peoples and districts of the peninsula. Only twice in the course of a long history has such an attempt led to success, whilst such mighty personalities as Frederick the Second of Hohenstaufen have been doomed to waste themselves in a vain striving to reach that end.

Yet every consummation of political union has been far from being a violent event, or a violation of the natural circumstances of the case. Rather has it always been felt as the crown and completion of a requirement suggested by the very nature and history of the land. Such a feeling would be inexplicable, were it not that, behind all differences and contrasts of the Italian realm, there has ever stood the reality of unity.

From the political field to those of geography and race this unity is expressed in a system of concentric circles. We may define them as State, Civilization and Nature. In the first and innermost of these circles unity is certainly most palpably revealed. But the unity could not be so revealed, so experienced as something natural and right, if it were not already present in the other circles and in one way or another established within them.

It has always been the case in Italy that a consciousness of essential spiritual kinship has preceded the political union of the nation. Civilization does indeed point inward to the state, but it also points to nature as the outermost of our concentric circles. All formations, all spiritual creations in this field always imply a resumption and further development of what was already indicated in the natural realm. Or, to put it in other words, the unity of Italy in state and civilization merely expresses that other unity, which, despite all internal differences, is given by the sharpness and definiteness of the geographical boundaries. We then come back to the observation with which we began; but now we can put it in the right light. Actually it is the sea, to which the peninsula surrenders on three sides, that makes the bounds of Italy. In one hard closed line runs the rim of coast, seldom relaxing into bays or outlying islands. On the north the Alps form a natural wall, a boundary that is not easily transgressed.

Thus the history of Italy, so far as it is conditioned by natural conditions, is revealed as the clash of two opposite principles, alternately ousting and seeking to overcome one another. On the one side is an extensive differentiation of geography and state, on the other a striving after unity. Beginning with the closed bounds set by nature to the peninsula, this striving is extended into civilization and state, so that, within these natural bounds, civilized life presses towards unification, and this effort then finds expression in the forms of politics.

In opposition to a widely accepted view we must emphasize the fact that the motley variety, intermixture and confused stratification of a diversity of peoples does not represent merely the result of a period of decline, which delivered up the land to the grip of foreign nations. No, these distinctions appeared at the moment when the first light of history fell on Italy. In the first half of the last millennium B.C. the racial classification is already as rich as imagination can conceive.

If we try now to divide the peoples into groups, we meet in the first place the Indo-Germans of Italy, the foremost bearers of its history. The mass of these is formed by those tribes which we are accustomed to call Italian in the

narrower sense. In historic times this mass was divided into two linguistic groups, the Latin-Faliscan and the Umbro-Sabellian. While the former group had originally scant enough room allotted it, the territory of the other extended over a mighty range. For the former group the boundaries are drawn at the north of Latium and a little strip on the right bank of the Tiber at the foot of Soracte; the realm of the other ran from the marshes and from Picenum in the north to the farthest south, and, at some points, took in the whole breadth of the peninsula.

The dialects of this group are correspondingly distributed. Umbrian in the beginning of history was confined to a small strip east of the Tiber from Ameria to the heights of Perugia; to this we must add Iguvium and part of the Apennine range. Closely attached to it were Picentine in the east—its membership of this group has only quite recently been recognized¹—and in the south the long series of Sabellian middle dialects. But it was the Samnite stock that succeeded in extending its range wider than any other. The mountainous country south of Maiella as far as the east coast, Campania in the west, Lucania and Bruttium all succumbed to it in turn. About the middle of the third century B.C. none could vie with it in extension and territory.

The Samnites themselves retained the memory of the fact that it was relatively late before they gained possession of what was later their territory. From the Sabine country in the north, it is said, they came, advancing in a series of thrusts. Before they came, other tribes, like them of Italian character, were settled in the south of the peninsula—the Oenotrians and Oscans, the Ausonians and Italians. The last-named people dwelling in the south of Bruttium, gave their name to the whole country.

Despite this extensive division into peoples and dialects, we had become accustomed to regard them all as one coherent whole. For the early study of languages it was a settled principle that the two groups of Latin-Faliscan and Umbro-Sabellian sprang from an original unity. True, they were already separate when they migrated into the peninsula, at dates succeeding one another. But behind them lay, as we thought we could discern, a single original stock of 'first

Italians', whose home was placed to the north of the Alps. Just as this people subsequently broke up into the two groups, Latin-Faliscan and Umbro-Sabellian, so each of them in its turn broke up into its separate peoples. This process of separation and independent growth of smaller units might be compared to the growth of a tree, which, springing from a single root, pushes out an ever increasingly delicate texture of branches.

This 'trunk theory', in the degree in which it once reigned undisputed, has to-day become subject to doubt and question. We had tried to conceive the manifold requirements of linguistic development under far too rigid a form; we had, to our contentment, reduced it to one single process. Through fission and repeated acts of fission, linguistic units were held to have arisen, which, no sooner had they appeared, entered on an individual development, largely isolated from their neighbours. Their growth must have been like that of cultivated plants, under ideal conditions artificially contrived. Yet any one who had made himself familiar with the story of the growth of the Greek dialects based on the migrations of peoples² or with the distribution, say, of the Romanic tongues,³ could not fail to realize how many were the possibilities of mutual influence, of blending and successive stratification, of continued operation of older forms under the cover of a later stage, with which one had to reckon.

Not less rigid is this theory in a second respect. On the strength of a postulate that was purely theoretical, all similarities in the two groups of Italic dialects were placed in an assumed age before history, all distinctions, on the other hand, in a later stage of development. By this means one passed over, without really solving it, an unmistakable difficulty, which lies in the separation of original Italic from a common Italic stock of language—let alone the fact that the implied supposition of an original Italic linguistic unity, present in the beginning, was scarcely encouraged by a comparison with the development of other languages that has taken place in historic times. It is not the unity, but the dialects that appear everywhere in the beginning. The due time must arrive, the conditions must be ripe for the formation of a language that embraces a multitude of peoples and

a wide range of territory. Such a language is the result of a definite historical preparation, and, as such, is a deliberate creation, not a gift that tumbles at the outset into the lap of nations before they have earned it.

These general objections to the earlier reigning theory are reinforced by certain observations, which have been made in the vocabulary of the two groups of Italic dialects.⁴ It is distinctive of that vocabulary, that it is just the most important and decisive conceptions that receive two distinct sets of names. And this is true of words that appear not only in the group in question, but are characteristic both of it and of one or more other Indo-Germanic languages. Thus, for example, the Latins share their term for fire (*ignis*) with Lithuanian, Slavonic, and Old Indian, while the Umbro-Sabellian shares its term (**pur*) with Greek, Armenian, and Tocharian; the same is true of the terms 'man', 'people', 'water', 'wall', 'god', and many more. These facts have been correctly interpreted as implying that both this distinction in the description of just those conceptions, which are usually of fundamental importance for the life and ideas of a people, and the age of this distinction must involve an original and fundamental contrast between the two groups, into which the Italic dialects fall.

There are other indications, which might seem to point in the same direction, for example, the linguistic connexions, from an early date, by which Latin-Faliscan and Umbro-Sabellian can be classed with the two great divisions of Celtic respectively, but we need not go into them here. Enough to say that we to-day are more and more inclined to the view that in these groups of Italian languages there is no question of an original unity, but rather of peoples once separate and independent of one another. Severally they loosed themselves from the Indo-Germanic complex and arrived in Italy at different periods. Only in Italy is there a gradual approximation of one to other, which, from about the beginning of historical times, led to an ever increasing contact and interpenetration.

We have discussed this point with some fullness, because it seems to us of decisive importance. For in it is already reflected in some measure the historical destiny of Italy in its contrasts of differentiation and unity. As everywhere in the realm of things Italian, so in the dialects are the most

violent differences at first contrasted. On the other hand, mutual interpenetration and a degree of unity as its result represent the end of a process, which gradually ripens towards historical expression. All the more important and far-reaching is the observation that this process of slow unification did not remain confined to those dialects which we have up to now discussed.

Beside the Italians in the narrower sense of the word the Illyrians play a privileged part among the Indo-Germanic peoples of the peninsula. It is only the very latest research that has taught us in some measure to appreciate this. This people settled at many points, especially on the east coast. But it only held its ground in continuous succession at two. To the south settled the Iapygians and Messapians in the region of Otranto and in Apulia, in the north-east, which still bears their name, the Venetians. These two groups stand in marked linguistic opposition, but their common derivation from the Illyrian stock is still undisputed.

Now it is most remarkable that certain developments of sound which are common to the two groups of Italian dialects and have therefore always counted as primitive Italian phenomena, appear again among these Illyrian tribes. For example, the variation of the diphthong *eu* > *ou* meets us not only in Latin-Faliscan and Umbro-Sabellian, but also among the Venetians and the Messapians.⁶ A second variation, of similar importance for the Italians—the passage from aspirated ‘media’ to sonant ‘tenues’ (*dh* > *þ*, *gh* > *χ*, *h* &c.)—has in Venetian at any rate something that partly corresponds to it.⁸

The fact, that of all the Illyrian peoples only those resident in Italy have shared, partially or completely, in these two forms of sound change, can only be explained on the assumption that the change in both cases has taken place on the spot, where all the languages in question stood together side by side—that is to say, in the peninsula of the Apennines.⁷ This must also imply that we are dealing in each case not with a primitive, but with a common Italian change, which can have taken place at earliest at the beginning of the historical period. A welcome confirmation⁸ of the transition from *eu* to *ou* is supplied by the form *Polouces*, under which the Greek Polydeukes was taken over by the Latins towards the close of the sixth century. Likewise the change from deriva-

tive *eu* to *ou* can only be understood on the assumption that this change of sound was still in full force at that period.⁹

But even more important than the exclusion of primitive Italian origin is the establishment of the fact that a development of sound could go beyond the Italians in the narrower sense and be carried over to the other Indo-Germans of the peninsula. It is certain of the change from *eu* to *ou*, that it took place from the farthest north-east down to Apulia. It extends, then, over the whole length of Italy; only at its boundaries does it come to a pause.

But the replacement of aspirate 'media' by soft spirants too is by no means restricted to the Italians or to them and the Venetians. It can be traced over the whole mainland and even farther south. Among the Sicels, who once occupied the east of the land that bears their name as well as a part of Bruttium, a similar phenomenon appears.¹⁰ The common labours of R. Thurneysen,¹¹ V. Pisani,¹² and A. v. Blumenthal¹³ on the one surviving inscription in Sicel (Jacobsohn no. 79 from Centorbi) have succeeded in establishing a series of remarkable agreements with the Italian languages. Of decisive importance is the evidence of the form *eredes*, nom. pl. = Latin *heredes*.¹⁴ For, in any case, whether it is to be assigned to a root **ǵhē(ǵ)* or **ǵher*,¹⁵ the Indo-Germanic aspirate 'media' must have developed through *χ*, *h* to pure psilosis. In the first stage of this development, i.e. in the stage *χ*, *h*, the Sicel word would stand by the side of the Italian dialects. In the same context we may place the words *λίτρα* and *λίτρη* which are attested as Sicel. The former, which should correspond to Latin *libra* from **lidhrā*, had still, as has been brilliantly observed,¹⁶ the sound value **līprā*, when taken over into Greek; the silent spirant in the lack of an exact equivalent was rendered by *τ*.¹⁷ Similar is the case of *λίτρη*, which belongs to the root **aiulh-* 'burn' (Latin *aedes*, Greek *αἶθω*).¹⁸ This too came to the Greeks as **Aīpnā* and the spirant was rendered by *τ*.

In this latter case it can be shown that the further course of linguistic development brought Sicel nearer to Latin. In agreement with further observations,¹⁹ the name of the mountain, Hesiod, *Theog.* 860, in contrast to the rest of the tradition, was *Ἀιδνῆ*. That Aetna is meant is shown by Eratosthenes.²⁰ Further, there is no reason for explaining the form by 'inexact acquaintance' with the Sicel name, as long as a satisfactory linguistic explanation can be given. As in Latin initial *β* becomes *f*, in agreement with Umbro-Sabellian, but medial *β*, in contrast to it, becomes *b* or *d*, so too here; the change from **aiḫna-* *λίτρη* to **aidnā-* *Ἀιδνῆ* exactly corresponds to Latin, in which it is only in the company of *r*, before *l* and after *u*, *v*, that *β* becomes *b*, whereas in all other cases *d* appears.

Here we can find an excellent place for the Sicel form *tebei*. This is one of the surest results of the newly discovered inscrip-

tion of Licodia Eubea,²¹ and shows that in Sicel, Indo-German *bh* medially becomes *b*. In this Sicel is again associated with Latin, in which the form was *tibi* (from **tebeti*) in contrast to Umbrian *tefe*. We may note in conclusion that this result is suggested by further observations: Sicel ζάγκλη = Latin *falcula*.²²

Here again is revealed in the history of the languages of Italy a principle that works against differentiation and separation into ever tinier parts and that drives them towards union. But we can trace it yet a step farther than before. Hitherto, despite all differences of detail, we have always been dealing with languages that were related by kinship to one another. It will now appear that this does not represent a final boundary to the workings of this principle.

As yet we have not touched one group among the languages of Italy, that of the pre-, non-Indo-Germanic population. Under this heading are comprised very diverse elements. For Corsica and Sardinia remains of such an original population are generally assumed. Besides them we may take account of the Sicanians in the west of Sicily and of the Ligurians; but up to now it has not been possible to place them with certainty. In the case of the former no clear evidence for their membership of the Iberian stock has yet been produced.²³ Of certain non-Indo-Germanic origin, even if not parts of the original population, are two peoples, the provenance of which in the Aegean is still under discussion. For the Elymians,²⁴ round Eryx and Segesta, this seems to be proved by their place-names, as also by their main cult. The Aphrodite of Eryx is, we must suppose, the special form of the goddess of Asia Minor, planted by immigrants on the dominating cliffs. The second race, the Eastern origin of which has since ancient times been asserted and denied with equal passion, is the Etruscans; it is the only one in this series to attain to historical importance.

We will not inquire at this point whether the Etruscan language has relatives and where they are to be sought—in Asia Minor or elsewhere. We need only observe that, despite its general divergence from Indo-German, contacts do occur in a number of individual points. This is particularly true of the Italian dialects, among which again Latin takes a foremost position.²⁵ The relationship was, in no sense, a

one-sided one, but there seems to have been a balance of give and take on both sides.

How vigorous was the exchange is shown not only by the number of loan words, but still more by the mixed formations that occur.²⁶ The name of the Etruscan national hero, Mastarna, for example, was formed out of a Latin word, only superficially adapted (Etruscan *macstrna* = Latin *magister* with Etruscan suffix *-na*).²⁷ From the Latin loan-word *parla* (from **paterla*) comes Etruscan *parliu* 'cook'.²⁸ Again, the month *Iunius*, called after the Latin goddess Juno, shows Etruscan influence in its form, replacing regular *Junonius* or *Junonalis*.²⁹

This mutual influence and penetration is seen far more clearly in the system of Italian names.³⁰ It is characterized by the differentiation of individual name (*praenomen*), chief name (*nomen*) and surname (*cognomen*). For the first Latin became very generally normative even within the Etruscan sphere,³¹ but for the last Etruscan supplied the model. It appeared there far earlier than with the Italians and served to distinguish different branches of one *gens*. Common to both languages is the main or gentile name, which originally gave expression to descent from a father or ancestor; in becoming the most important element it involved the degradation of the individual name to the rank of a mere *praenomen*. We can observe, not merely that the descendants of a man with Etruscan individual name are designated by Etruscan suffixes, those of a man with Italian name by Italian, but also that from the very first there was exchange between the two parties. As in this kind of name-formation a single suffix is usually insufficient and a heaping up and agglomeration of suffixes is characteristic, we can establish the most diverse variations of Etruscan and Italian elements. Here is the proof that a severe separation of the languages is not feasible. Both peoples, Etruscans and Italians, have formed their system by what was essentially a common effort.

With this bringing in of Etruscan the process of conformation and unification in the Italian languages reached its highest point of efficiency. Actually, almost the whole extent of the peninsula is in one way or another embraced by it. The unity of Italy, present but as yet latent, begins to be drawn in its first outlines.

We have now reached the point where the purely linguistic survey leads beyond its narrower boundaries. The working out of that system of names, which we call Etruscan, but ought rather to call Italian, and no less its successful extension and completion imply as bearer a unified social stratum.

They are conditioned by a supremacy of *gentes*, by an aristocratic organization of society. The gentile name could only attain to such a degree of importance, if great stress was laid on membership of the *gens*. So too in the Middle Ages the family name was first developed in those places where noble families played a part, in the Italian city republics and in Byzantium.³² So too in ancient Italy a mass of such *gentes* may have felt itself a higher class, of common character and origin, and such a feeling might find expression in a closed form of life and custom. In earliest Rome, it seems, we can still in some degree grasp this as a fact.³³ Noble *gentes* from abroad with their whole body of adherents were taken over without question into the Roman citizen-body, and were granted the social position that matched their origin. Besides the Tarquins we may mention the Claudii, whose settlement in Rome is placed by tradition in the earliest days of the Republic. Only in later times did Rome pass to a less open-hearted policy.

These last observations have brought us to the discussion of general conditions of culture. It will be no unwelcome completion of our argument if here too we can demonstrate phenomena of a similar kind.

Once again, it is not the case that Rome and the Roman unification of Italy first gave it a unified surface. True, it was only with them that this unifying process became complete, that it was most lastingly carried through. But before it went another similar process, that embraced the land from Upper Italy as far as Campania, and even as far as Samnium and Apulia. The stratum thus produced is commonly called Etruscan, but that name obscures its supra-tribal character; we shall therefore in future call it 'ancient Italian'. But even this was not the first of its kind. It had its forerunner in those very times, when the tribes of the peninsula were preparing to step out of the twilight of prehistory into the light of history.

Italy by herself in the early Iron Age seems to offer anything but a simple and obvious picture.³⁴ The conception of successive incursions of immigrant bands of Indo-Germanic tribes has been replaced by the recognition that many divergent groups coexist and clash. No inconsiderable rôle

beside the 'Terramare' people, up to now classed as Indo-German, must be assigned to the certainly non-Indo-Germanic, aboriginal element (the 'Extraterramaricoli'). The still unsolved problem of the origin of the Etruscans also comes into play; they were certainly already settled in the land that bears their name.³⁶ All the more remarkable is it that the circle of Villanova culture, which spreads from the beginning of the first millennium, embraces at one and the same time Emilia, Toscana and Latium. The distinctions of district are by no means lost, but the development of a unified culture—the first to arise in Italy—may still be recognized as the new and salient feature.³⁶

Two further peculiarities enable us to draw our picture with even clearer lines.

The first is, that the Villanova culture shows a very marked contrast to its predecessors in time and place. Its settlements lack that rigid frame of circumvallation, that arrangement by 'cardo' and 'decumanus', that was so characteristic of the Terramare fortresses. In their place appears an open and loose method of settlement, which continues even when for security's sake they withdrew to the heights.³⁷ The ornamentation of Villanova products is distinguished by its tendency towards breadth and richness, even towards excess, from the incomparably simpler forms of the Terramare finds, nor less from the pointed and abrupt pictures in which the art of the 'Extraterramaricoli' finds its expression.³⁸ It is a new development, a changed style of art and life that becomes clearly visible in the Villanova Age.

Further, the emergence of the new element cannot be brought into causal connexion with any immigration from north to south.³⁹ Not only the earliest appearance,⁴⁰ but also the highest quality of the finds ⁴¹ always belongs to the south. We cannot, of course, rule out the possibility that wanderings and shiftings of population may have gone hand in hand with the emergence of the new culture. But this possibility is without decisive importance and an attribution to definite tribes or to historically authenticated movements of peoples has nowhere yet been convincingly achieved.⁴² We must venture for once (and, I imagine, the venture must not be confined to this one case) to make a fundamental

separation of culture and peoples' wanderings⁴³ and to admit for the former a supra-tribal, general Italian character. In this we shall find an important agreement with the linguistic conditions that we have sketched; the results in the two fields mutually support and confirm one another.

(b) FORMS OF THE ANCIENT MEDITERRANEAN CIVILIZATION

The attempt has been made to regard the beginning of the Middle Age as an incursion of tribes till then on the periphery, and, in particular, of the Germans and Arabs, into what was then the main sphere of culture, the lands round the Mediterranean. Without doubt this represents an important part of what actually happened, inasmuch as a series of tribes, which had lived aloof from the great historical centres, then first came into lasting contact with the late antique civilization. For the early history of antiquity too this point of view proves fruitful. The immigrations of the Greek peoples from the north of the Balkans must undoubtedly be considered as a similar incursion into the Mediterranean centre. Beside many less-developed cultures, which can only be grasped to-day in faint traces, in Asia Minor and in Crete, the new-comers were confronted by a world, in which the nature of the ancient Mediterranean lands had created for itself one of its most highly developed and most expressive forms.

The settlement, which the immigrants made with this world and in which they passed through every possible phase, from war-like encounter to adoption and absorption of it, implies that no account of Greek history can pass by ancient Crete. Not that in Crete and its culture any part of Greek nationality or Greek character found expression—quite the reverse; rather that Greece had to come to terms with this unlike, this opposite world and in the course of this process developed its proper form. In fact, a comparison of early Greece with ancient Crete is better suited than any other to throw up in contrast the special quality of the Greek.

Our last remark yields a result of fundamental importance: through contrast with a prehistoric culture a historical culture

has been grasped in its individuality. The inferences to be drawn for Italy are obvious.

The immigration of the Italians, like that of the Greeks, implies an incursion of people of the periphery into the Mediterranean zone. There they did not at once meet the Greeks, but in the west too the Indo-Germanic stratum is preceded by another, which belongs to the old Mediterranean circle.⁴⁴ The chance of comparison, which we have suggested, is thus confirmed. Once again the new element—in this case the rise of the historical culture of Italy and, above all, of Rome in conflict with the Greeks—can be set off against that older layer as against a background.

For Italy indeed a further peculiarity comes into play. In the Aegean, the new Hellenic culture took shape almost exclusively in contrast to what it found there, occasionally adopting and using what was at hand, but always giving it an original shape; with the inhabitants of the Apennine peninsula, the process was by no means so simple. Non-Indo-Germanic tribes of ancient Mediterranean origin succeeded in maintaining their individuality till far into historical times, in fact did not complete their development till then. And, what is more, large parts of the Indo-Germans of Italy opened their hearts to the old Mediterranean ways and long clung to their forms. But more of this in our next chapter.

As representatives of the old Mediterranean culture in the Italian sphere we can reckon Malta, Sardinia and the zone of the rock-sculptures, which we have still to sketch. When we mention them in this context we mean to say that we have in all these cases to deal with a world of forms, which at the time of its fullest development, by virtue of its special character, diverges from the Greek and takes rank with the ancient and early cultures of the Mediterranean basin. We deliberately restrict our survey to those regions which attained to monumental and clearly distinct forms. Sardinia, in particular, has enjoyed the exceptional luck of being able to develop this form with as good as no interference. The inaccessibility of the interior long preserved Sardinian civilization from the contact of Carthaginians, Greeks and Romans and, when the Romans took possession of the island, they still found there this relic of an age long past.

1. *Malta.* The island of Malta can only with some reserve be assigned to the Italian sphere. Just as it naturally belongs to North Africa, so too are close parallels to its artistic achievements found there; ⁴⁵ other indications point to the Balearic Isles or to Spain, ⁴⁶ only a few to Sicily or Apulia.⁴⁷ For all that, the neolithic and cypolithic culture of Malta has always had an exceptional importance for the recognition of the character of the ancient Mediterranean world. We cannot, therefore, entirely omit it in this context. Without any attempt at completeness we select a few traits, which seem to us to deserve attention.

A word first about the representation of human beings. We all know that series of women, usually seated, of limestone or clay, that so clearly determines the picture of Maltese plastic art.⁴⁸ It is remarkable at once that only women appear, nor less that they are usually shown undraped. It is buxom, almost wanton forms that meet our eyes; the type of the 'fat' woman of the old stone age is everywhere retained here, if not actually exaggerated.⁴⁹ There are few examples of the representation of the elementary physical nature of woman in such direct forms.

To the excessive development of the body—breast, belly, hips and buttocks—corresponds a heavy, earth-bound, sitting posture. It is not without significance that these women sometimes actually squat on the ground; in their whole nature they seem to be fettered to the earth, to be sprung from it and thus to be a part of it. Similar is the impression made by the representation of the famous 'sleeping' woman,⁵⁰ who this time is clad in a dress; there is in it a complete abandonment, a dull prostration that lends itself to comparison with the sitting posture.

Comparatively seldom appears the standing motif, and it is remarkable enough how it is treated. If the woman wears the dress, which we have met with in the 'sleeping' figure, it may perhaps rest on all sides on the ground, like a heavy mass, laid about the body, assisting it to a stability which it could hardly attain of itself.⁵¹ Or the figures are half stuck in the block that serves them as a support; ⁵² sometimes, to our feeling, sculpture in the round, plastic, and relief are not clearly distinguished.⁵³ Only occasionally in the figures of

naked women ⁵⁴ does a free standing posture appear. The huge masses of flesh, which are piled on one another, only sustain themselves by their own gravity; there is nothing else to strain and hold them, but, where everything is crowded together or piled up motionlessly, sheer heaviness is exalted into a principle of stability.

Indeed it is volume as such that dominates. The limbs and members seem scarcely to free themselves from the mass of stone, the human figure still stays bound fast in the material. Like heavy, unformed blocks, hips and navel, rump and arms are piled one above another; it is no architectural system, only a massing of solid forms. As though drenched in a heavy lethargy, these features shape themselves but slowly and with hesitation into sensibility and life.⁵⁵

In this natural, earthy, elemental world it is no accident that the woman takes the first place. The male is not really in place at all here; seldom does he intrude and then only in his most primitive form—the phallus.⁵⁶

With this picture that begins to unroll before us the architecture corresponds to perfection and enriches it with new traits. Its masterpieces are the buildings of Hal Saffieni and Tarxien, Hagiar Kim and Mnajdra, and the Gigantia works on Gozzo. In megalithic structure lies the original and unshaped, the massy and unorganized element already implied. At the same time there is revealed a delight in lasting materials, which would vie with Nature herself in indestructibility. As in the design so too in the ground plan appears, as determinant, a wide expansiveness, a spatial contour, that causes the round to pass over into the oval. A regard for the axis is in so far present as two oval spaces are sometimes laid one above another in such a way that their longitudinal axes run parallel; these spaces are joined in the middle by a short passage, which widens above the top space into an apse.⁵⁷ Beyond this, however, the formation of larger groupings is only achieved by mere juxtaposition and mutual accommodation,⁵⁸ like those stereometric compositions, the arrangement of which we found distinctive for the character of plastic art.

Most important of all is the fact that these buildings are one and all vaulted ⁵⁹ and were partially situated under-

ground; Hal Saffieni actually has two underground storeys.⁶⁰ It is no sense of breadth or joy in light and sky, in distance and transparency that finds expression here; it is the cave that is the model.⁶¹ Narrowness and earthiness, darkness and love of depth are the determining motifs. With the depression, weight and shapelessness that we have already noted, these elements join unasked in union.

The purpose of these buildings has not yet been certainly determined. Religious significance, in the most general sense, is attested by the altars, basins, sacrificial trenches, and niches⁶² that have been found, by the menhirs and bactyls.⁶³ The underground cave of Hal Saffieni was used from the first as a place of burial. Connexions with the ancient Sardinian graves of Anghelu Ruju force themselves on our attention.⁶⁴ In cypolithic and aenolithic times the sanctuary of Hal Tarxien was used for the deposit of urns, containing the ashes of the dead.⁶⁵ Whether the rest of the buildings were used in earlier times as graves, in which the corpses were laid unburnt,⁶⁶ is uncertain. A chthonic cult, whatever its exact character, is everywhere unmistakable⁶⁷ and with this harmonizes the view that many of the female statues represent a goddess,⁶⁸ and also the supposed appearance of a place of oracle.⁶⁹ The strongest and mightiest buildings, then, that this ancient civilization has produced, were raised for the dead and the nether gods; they stand in striking contrast to the slighter, ephemeral character, which we usually find in the dwellings of the living.⁷⁰ It was towards the other world, the powers of the earth and the underworld that this civilization was directed; for them and for them alone did they build a sure house and succeed in raising it to monumental forms.

Finally there should follow a reference to the tower-buildings of Malta.⁷¹ But more vital observations on these lines may be made in connexion with the Sardinian Nuraghi.

2. *Sardinia.* Our last remark has brought us to the second sphere of ancient Mediterranean civilization, with which we have to deal. In Sardinia the country itself seems at once to strike the note, which rang so loudly in our ears in the last section—it is a depressed, heavy, unformed land. It has been justly observed that its original connexion with

the civilization of the land can still be realized. 'That trees and heaps of stones on this island of chthonic cults of water-deities and the dead throw the deepest blue shadows that I have ever seen in an ancient landscape may be no more than an observation of modern sensibility. But a characteristically chthonic tendency in the natural form of the island is unmistakable. The low, huddled, knotty trees on the stony plateau of Santa Vittoria di Serri chime in with the tone of that religion that has erected its chthonic sanctuary there.' These are the words of Kerényi,⁷² speaking of a form of ancient Sardinian civilization, expressed and revealed in stone.

The most conspicuous sign of this culture is the Nuraghe. In essential form a round tower, built without mortar in concentric layers of stone, it represents a development of the ancient Mediterranean round house, fashioned for purposes of defence and carried up to the monumental scale.⁷³ The use of the pointed vault looks in the same direction; ⁷⁴ indeed, this defensive tower of stone, designed both for the residence and the fort of the members of a war-like aristocracy, is most suggestive for the early forms of civilization in the whole Mediterranean basin.

There is a second point that expresses perhaps even more clearly than these formal agreements the associations of the Nuraghe. We cannot fail to see in it the aiming at the massive, the overpowering, the superhuman. While the outer shape stresses the solid block, the defiant, the enduring, obvious importance is attached to the piling on one another of the mightiest possible rocks. Even the coarse and irregular order, that such a procedure involves, seems to be sought rather than avoided. The analogy of Malta offers itself unsought. From Malta it is not far to the 'Cyclopean' style of the castles of Tiryns and Mycenae; ⁷⁵ everywhere the measureless and shapeless is exalted into a principle.

The meaning of all this becomes clear the moment that we apply the comparison with the later architecture of Greece. Here we find two things that are new after all that had gone before. From now on man is to be the measure of things for the architectural disposition of space and masses. His physical proportions supply the scale; only beginning with

him and them is an architectural creation any longer possible. Even when it rises to the monumental scale it never trespasses beyond the sphere assigned to it, but develops the human principle to its highest scope and dignity. The second point is this; the architecture of this character is separated from the realm of nature as a world of its own. In contrast to nature's limitlessness rules here a fixed norm; in contrast to her incomprehensibility and mystery an order, transparent because it is the creation of the spirit; in contrast to her growth and decay the shaping element implied in deliberate adaptation.

How contrary to this is all that is revealed in the building style of the Mycenaean civilization and even more in the Nuraghe! If the human element dominated in Greece, here rules the immensity of the gigantic and Cyclopean. If there a spiritual order found expression, that deliberately draws away from the facts of mere nature, here we find competition with her products and her method. The piling up of stone masses and mighty blocks, the emphasizing of the unbroken majesty of the elementally material selects definite sides of nature and of natural existence; to them as a goal it tries to direct its own buildings.⁷⁶

By a similar set of contrasts we can sketch the position assignable to the first stages of Sardinian plastic art. The finds of votive figures of bronze and clay yield a relatively rich material.⁷⁷

We have already spoken of the solid pictures of which the plastic art of ancient Malta is composed. A similar character may be sought in a wider and more imposing form in other parts of the Mediterranean sphere. For all pre-Greek, most of all perhaps for Egyptian art, a principle of formation holds good, which some have even ventured to describe by the name of law;⁷⁸ sculpture in the round appears as if regularly confined within a system of limiting planes that surround it. In detail it is so arranged that these all run parallel to the main plane that is shown in frontal view or else meet it at right angles. The result is a building up of the figure from outside, from the surfaces that surround it and include it within a cubic system.

We cannot here discuss in detail all the differences between

the minor plastic art of Sardinia and the productions of ancient Oriental art, as well as those of others that are geographically nearer to it. We shall scarcely be wrong in admitting very considerable differences in quality and form (in the sense for mass, for example). For all that, there seems to be assurance that the principle we have just sketched extends to Sardinia too.

It is obvious at once that a main plane is sought after and is set in direct view before the spectator. In the case of the statuette of a warrior in Paris ⁷⁹ (to take a single example) this plane is determined by the level of the shield, which is held in front of the body. Parallel to it runs the front plane of the body, formed by the flat, almost board-like trunk, by head, upper arm and front of the legs. But from the sides everything is done to set the neighbouring parts in a single plane. The body is here determined by a plane that descends almost vertically; running from shoulder to feet it meets at right angles the main plane that we have just sketched.

This system is further worked out in the formation of groups. In the common representation of a mother with a child in her bosom the principle is carried so far that the two are arranged at right angles to each other; while the mother looks straight ahead, the child turns sideways from the main line of direction. In this point, agreement with Egyptian art is so strong that we can even point out identical solutions of problems now and again.⁸⁰

In its inner meaning another characteristic of Sardinian art is most intimately connected with this. In it is revealed an amazing contrast between an outward form that is supremely realistic and devoted to all actual details and a lack of any kind of architectural or organizing element in the building up of the group as a whole. In the one case there is an alert sense of observation and a communicativeness which registers every detail of clothing or armament; in the other, there is an incompleteness of inner form, which cannot advance its fundamental conception of a human body beyond that of a doll-like idol. The closest possible comparison seems to be offered by the nearly contemporary, late Mycenaean art.⁸¹ That art, too—in contrast to minor plastic art in Crete, with its taste for something quite distinct, for the

vigour of growth and expansion, for the bloom of the vegetable kingdom⁸²—while as interested as the Sardinian in all externals of clothing is confined to a similar formal presentation of the body.

Here Greek art diverges with deliberate emphasis.⁸³ Not from the outside, whether by a system of planes or by communication of clothing and appendages, of weapons or gestures, does it essay to realize the human form; it apprehends it rather as a system, held together by a principle working outward from within. The organic growth of the plant and the architecture of the body that depends on it are here the prevailing principles. The parts that are of functional importance—breast and navel, muscles and joints—as representatives of this principle, are often visualized with a clearness that is deliberately exceptional. It is not the outward appearance, but the inner form, whose mere expression the outer is, that Greece strives to apprehend in its significant connexion.

In a world, that still lacks feeling for the architectural build of the human figure, the *εἶδος πολύγυιον*⁸⁴ is consequently legitimate. The plastic art of ancient Sardinia,⁸⁵ in availing itself of this form of expression for the representation of heroic and divine beings, again takes its place by the side of the art of the Aegean and of the ancient East. At its root lies a conception of the divine, which runs in an exactly opposite direction to that which later found its full expression in Greece. No, man and man alone is not the only fit form to express the godhead; he is not even its measure and spiritual norm. Rather he remains by his very nature fettered to nature. This is particularly evident, when by the accumulation of attributes and limbs an advance beyond the narrower human sphere and with it the sense of the supernatural and divine finds expression. That luxuriance, even in its excess, still denotes at bottom once more a natural, definitely vegetable process.

To this suspension of interest corresponds a general linking up of the divine idea with the elementary world, again comparable to what we may observe in the Aegean circle. The worship of streams and waters, incubation, a general chthonic direction of the divine powers, and at the same time

a direction towards reproduction and the creation of life, finally animal shapes for the gods themselves—these are its most palpable signs.⁸⁰ It is significant that the bull-god, who meets us in Sardinia, is one of the commonest forms to occur in the east of the Mediterranean.⁸⁷ That the double-axe—to add a further point—appears beside him as a religious emblem, simply confirms the connexion.⁸⁸ Places of worship on hills, too, can be attested in many places. Giara di Serri is a magnificent example; we might also mention Orulù,⁸⁹ where the comparison with the Canaanite practice,⁹⁰ and also with such a Cretan hill-worship as that of Petsofà,⁹¹ forces itself on the attention.

Lastly, a word about the organization of society; it, too, seems to fit into the picture we have drawn.

We have already mentioned the connexion between Nuraghe and round house. This round house appears in Sardinia not only translated into monumental form, but also in its original shape. Here, in direct contrast to the Nuraghe, an isolated appearance is avoided and the group is preferred. There are whole villages of huts, where the single buildings unite in a kind of scattered, yet huddled formation, to make swarm-like masses.⁹² The very word 'swarm' seems to me to express the fact that the multiplicity here, by the manner in which it is inwardly combined, belongs to the order of nature.

This is seen even more clearly in another case. The round building, as such, has no meaning except as a whole based on and bounded by itself. If it is to be fitted into an inclusive order of architecture the difficulty at once appears, that such a building has no proper axis, i.e. no definite orientation. Attempts to remedy this were made in various ways,⁹³ but they remained isolated and were scarcely ever effective in the lay-out of larger structures. Where several round huts combine to form a continuous and regular whole, regulation of axis is entirely dispensed with. We have already used the simile of a swarm; a second simile, also drawn from nature, is now appropriate: I mean, the combination of crystals or of a beehive. Hut-wall is fixed to hut-wall; separation into individual compartments is abandoned and the result is a system of cells, which is only interrupted by occasional approaches or narrowings.⁹⁴

In the East, too, we know of a similar phenomenon in the hut-urns of Melos; ⁹⁵ some have even wished to associate with them the royal palaces of Crete. ⁹⁶ But in the latter case the straight lines at once imply a difference, whilst a second difference is revealed, the moment that we scrutinize the social basis of the Sardinian style of building.

The close union of the lodgements, the natural combination and associated growth of the single round houses must have something to correspond to them in the order of the inhabitants who chose this form. Among them, too, must have existed a close unity and we are probably justified in inferring that it must have been one that rested like them on a natural order, i.e. one dependent on blood-relationship. In other words, living together in a web of cells means in architecture what organization by families, brotherhoods, clans, and tribes means in human society. ⁹⁷ The shape of the architecture and the organization of society both essentially coincide with the conditions of the life of nature.

8. *The Cultures of the Rock Sculptures.* Interest in the drawings scratched on Italian rocks ⁹⁸ has quite recently been aroused by the penetrating observation devoted to the 'stelae' of Novilara. ⁹⁹ These are funereal stelae of sandstone, all coming from the narrow range of northern Picenum; they are covered with drawings of figures, which are scratched, and inscriptions, which, by way of contrast, are chiselled. Norden assigned these 'stelae', with the whole of the culture of North Picenum, to an aboriginal people of Italy. Confirmation of this view was seen by him in the obvious antiquity of the finds, ¹⁰⁰ in the non-Indo-Germanic character of the inscriptional texts and in the relationship of the scratchings to ancient northern rock-pictures (Bohuslän, Schoonen, Ostergotland), which seemed to him to show the same style.

Little as I am disposed to contest Norden's main thesis, ¹⁰¹ I must still make considerable deductions from the assertions just quoted.

It is no doubt true that the representations of ships on the Novilara 'stelae' is distinct from those of the Dipylon vases, ¹⁰² but they are not on that account to be associated at once with the drawings of Bohuslän. The different length of the ships, the difference, sometimes complete, in the

general shape, above all the fact, overlooked by Norden, that the northern rock-pictures do not strictly show ships at all, but rafts ¹⁰³—all these exclude any possibility of proving agreement.

Further, the 'stelae' bear inscriptions in an alphabet derived from the Corinthian.¹⁰⁴ We must, then, at least raise the question whether in the pictures too a Greek influence, direct or indirect, can be demonstrated. Norden, indeed, thought that the contrast between figures and legend constituted the point of peculiar interest in the Picentine drawings; 'that in them there falls on the mysterious darkness of prehistory the gleam of an event of first-class importance for the history of civilization, the inscription in Greek letters'. He himself, however, has seen ¹⁰⁵ that the figure of a lion on the 'stela' of Fano has its prototype on Corinthian vases.¹⁰⁶ Further this lion advances against the man seated to his left, to tear or devour him: this feature too is familiar to us from Corinthian vases or their Etruscan imitations.¹⁰⁷ So too the warrior on the right has his forerunners in the early Corinthian style; ¹⁰⁸ Etruscan or Venetian designs ¹⁰⁹ may have been the intermediaries. Finally, for the erotic scenes on the 'stela' of Pesaro we know correspondences in the sepulchral art of Etruria; ¹¹⁰ that such scenes should recur on the Picentine grave-monuments should surprise us the less, as the obscene so often recurs in the realm of death and the grave.¹¹¹

We cannot aim at heaping up further material. The important point is, that Greek and Greek-Italian influences are already recognizable. In Picenum, it is true, they were subjected to a peculiar change; the fact remains that the comparison with the ancient material from the north can no longer be carried through.

But in what points are we to recognize the native adaptation? It is not hard to see that behind these pictures lie compositions in strips, arranged one over another in archaic style. On the 'stela' of Fano three such strips are present, whilst on the 'stela' of Pesaro fragments of these are still to be seen everywhere—only that they are distributed capriciously over the surface, without any relation to one another.¹¹² The maker has broken up the form allotted to him to suit his own alien sense of form, has adapted, or, if you will,

dismembered it. Or, to put it in other words, Greek form impinged on an existing native form of opposite character, and the result of the conflict is revealed on our 'stelae'; on these stand in immediate juxtaposition the remains of an ancient school of art and a new import from Greece.

What lends such assurance to our interpretation is the fact that we possess in Italy a far older and widely diffused art of drawing on rock. Relations to it can be easily established. Norden has already observed that the pot-bellied 'manikins' of the 'stela' of Fano have their analogies in a rock-drawing of Fontanalba.¹¹³ Other evidence might be added; that beasts similar to those on the 'stela' of Fano recur at Cimbergo, that the contrasted couples recur at Naquane, that the 'manikins' recur at both places.¹¹⁴ In mentioning these places we have named the main regions that yield the finds on which our knowledge in the first place rests: the Ligurian Alps and Apennines and Val Camonica north of Brescia. A wide and almost unworked field is opening up here to comparison and observation.

Here we can do no more than indicate the whole wealth available and draw a few main lines.

We must mention, first of all, the zone of rock-drawings in the Val Camonica. Here, in the villages of Capidiponte, Fucine, Nadro, Naquane, and Cimbergo is a vast mass of rock-drawings, which has up to the very present steadily increased in extent.¹¹⁵ On the rock terraces above the valley a whole world in picture is unrolled; hunts and processions, cult practices of every kind, buildings and representations of labyrinths. In one case we find in the midst of a herd of deer an armed man, standing on the back of a similar beast; ¹¹⁶ this reminds us of the ancient Sardinian 'deer-man' of Teti Abini and his Eastern parallels.¹¹⁷ In a few places two layers are distinct; whereas the older contains almost exclusively pictures of beasts and will still belong to the neolithic age, the later is to be attributed to the bronze and early iron age.¹¹⁸

The Val Camonica gets its name from the tribe of the *Camunni*, through whose territory the Oglio flows, before it pours into the Lago d' Iseo (*lacus Sebenicus*).¹¹⁹ This tribe belongs, as Cato attests (in Pliny, *n. h.* 3, 134), to the people of the Euganeans. Livy (1, 1, 3) and other writers ¹²⁰

report that before the coming of the Illyrian Venetians they held the whole land between the Alps and the sea.

This information admits of some very interesting conclusions. It was at the beginning of the first millennium B.C. that the Venetians, coming from the Balkans, pressed over Styria into the modern province of Venetia.¹²¹ The oldest settlements are Angerano and Monte Lozzo, the highest peak of the so-called Euganean Mountains.¹²² The original extension and prime of the Euganeans, then, lay at an earlier date. To them belonged the hut-dwellings of the cypolithic age at Morlungo, the pile-dwellings of Molina di Ladro, Arquà Petrarca and on Lago Cimone.¹²³ To these same Euganeans, then, must be assigned not only the later rock-drawings of Val Camonica, but also those of the earlier style. With this agrees entirely the fact, recently demonstrated by Norden, that the Euganeans are an aboriginal people of Italy.¹²⁴

The comparison with the 'stelae' of Novilara is now peculiarly attractive. Not only have we to do in both cases with the same kind of art production and with a pre-Indo-Germanic people; the Euganeans, too, experienced the influence of Greek models, at least on the later rock-drawings. The confronted warriors find their parallels in archaic Greek and early Italian art.¹²⁵ Often, where horses are shown,¹²⁶ we may remind ourselves of Corinthian work¹²⁷ or of pieces of the finds of Trebenische.¹²⁸ Without in any way wishing to exhaust the question, we may at once point out the exactly analogous case of both sets of pictures, in the art of Novilara and that of Val Camonica. But, in the second case, conditions are immensely more favourable, in as much as the stage of purely native style that went before need not be divined, but is available in numerous examples.

If we look about us for further possibilities of comparison, we must at least mention the rock-scratchings, which have been found¹²⁹ on the stone figures of Lagundo.¹³⁰ A second, vastly more extensive field, is supplied by the second region, already mentioned, of rock-drawings, marked by the names of Val Fontanalba, Vallaretta, Valmasca, Laghi delle Merviglie, all situated in the Italian Maritime Alps.¹³¹ A relation to Val Camonica is obvious and cannot be called into question by appeal to the peculiarities that occur on both sides.¹³²

Further, with the agreements in style and content may be set arguments from history.

The Capitoline Fasti chronicle under the year 117 B.C. a triumph *de Liguribus Stoenis*.¹³³ This tribe, the *Stoeni*, which is generally reckoned to the Euganeans (Pliny, *n. h.* 3, 134; Strabo 4, p. 204) was also of Ligurian nationality. It was a detached fraction of the main people; when first the Umbrians,¹³⁴ then the Celtic invasion pushed between the Ligurian and Euganean tribes, a fragment of the first was forced with the second into the Southern Alps. There Livy (5, 35, 1) knows of the tribe of the *Libui* in the neighbourhood of Brescia and Verona, not far, then, from Val Camonica; it is sometimes described as Gallic (21, 28, 7), sometimes, with the *Laevi*, as Ligurian (33, 37, 6).¹³⁵ Here, then, even in historical times, contact with the Ligurians must have continued to exist.

We need not enter here into further details, as, for example, the occasional occurrence of rock-drawings on Sardinian grave-stones.¹³⁶ It will be clear that we find an extensive occurrence of rock-pictures at no less than three places in the Apennine peninsula. In two cases they belong to pre-Indo-Germanic tribes; in the case of the Ligurians the question, how far such elements were merged in them, must for the time being be left uncertain.¹³⁷ But we can go even earlier. The Grotta Romanelli in the Terra d' Otranto belongs to the earlier Stone Age.¹³⁸ With this we reach a conclusion of fundamental importance.

To-day we have sufficient knowledge of the art of rock-pictures in the palaeolithic age in the West of Europe to be able to form some estimate of their importance for later times. From the latest finds it is plain that the two styles, the so-called Franco-Cantabrian and the East Spanish or 'Levant' style, existed contemporaneously in the peninsula of the Pyrenees. They mark at once the beginning and the mightiest achievement of the ancient Mediterranean culture. Its circle of influence extended not only to Africa¹³⁹ and the Scandinavian North,¹⁴⁰ but to Italy as well. Evidence for this is given not only by the Grotta Romanelli, but also in later times by the rock-drawings which we have been discussing. The manifold contacts, which can be established with the rock-sculpture of the ancient north—I think particularly of the characteristic foot-prints which have now been

found in Val Camonica too ¹⁴¹—can most easily be explained in this manner.

Here once more the culture of the ancient Mediterranean projects into the Italian sphere, and with one of its most distinctive and magnificent creations.

(c) THE BEGINNING OF GREEK INFLUENCE

1

It is at once remarkable that the Greeks entered Italy under the form of myth. Their name for it is Hesperia,¹⁴² the land of the evening and the west, and the special nature of this description is shown by the fact that no corresponding east or south land took its place beside it. In this Hesperia is localized the world of fabulous creatures, which are most closely connected with night and the dead. In the volcanic district of Cumae, Solfatara, or, as it was anciently known, the Phlegrean Fields, with its lakes, it was believed that the entrance to the underworld and the "*Αοργος λίμνη*" was to be found. But Hesperides and Laestrygonians, Scylla and Charybdis, Calypso and Circe, too, were all placed on Italian soil.

Circe already appears at the close of Hesiod's *Theogony*, in connexion with Odysseus, at the Cape on the Latin coast that bears her name.¹⁴³ It is hard to suppose that she was already the dazzling lady of the Homeric epic. Even as the mountain, that carries her temple, is wild, desolate and sundered from the human sphere, filled with the loneliness, the enchantments and horrors of the surrounding marshes, which once ringed it,¹⁴⁴ so too must the goddess who dwelt there have once been more like Hecate ¹⁴⁵ or one of the ghostly queens of the lower and outer world than Aphrodite.¹⁴⁶

The Sirens, too, were localized on the Italian coast, and nothing could better visualize their character than the islands in the Posidonian Gulf (*i galli*) that are named after them. The enticement, the tempting irresistible quality of a southern sea and, in contrast, the bald, death-like hardness of the rocks that project from it—that is the very contrast that marks these sweet-voiced, but deadly goddesses.

One word more for the heroic saga. The creatures, just

named, are almost all connected most intimately with Odysseus; we have already spoken of the hero himself in connexion with Circe. We need not be surprised to see the adventures of Odysseus transferred to the Italian realm. Played, as they are, between life and death, upper world and world of the departed, where else could they be imagined? But Philoctetes, Aeneas and Diomedes, too, are led by their destiny into the west; here their heroic career finds its completion. All of them found their graves in Italian earth. The weapons of Philoctetes were exhibited in the temple of Apollo Alaios, his grave in Makalla or in Thurium.¹⁴⁷ Aeneas was imagined in Latium, rapt from men in the Numicus,¹⁴⁸ whilst Diomedes was slain by the 'wolf' Daunus,¹⁴⁹ the lord of the outer world and of death.

It is the memories of the dead companions of Aeneas¹⁵⁰ and Odysseus¹⁵¹ that line the coast as far north as Latium.¹⁵² The promontory, even the rocky islands off the coast and the outlying reefs, have turned to 'hills of death', to quote an expression of K. Kerényi; the Middle Ages still made the Emperor Frederick the Second enter Etna after his death and have his abode there.¹⁵³ In Dante, finally, appears the magnificent picture of the souls of the dead, like birds, waiting for their last journey in the reeds at the mouth of the Tiber.¹⁵⁴

Two other figures of the Trojan War require a special mention. On the hill of Drion lay the shrine of the hero Calchas; he who consulted its oracle first sacrificed a black ram and then covered himself in its skin.¹⁵⁵ At the foot of the same hill was the grave of Podaleirios; from it sprang a healing fountain, as Strabo, our only authority, relates (6, p. 284). It seems to be certain that what is meant is the modern Monte Gargano, on the coast of Apulia.¹⁵⁶ Here the archangel Michael has replaced the Homeric seer, just as he in his time replaced an older, pre-historic cult.¹⁵⁷ Even to-day the place has an awe of its own, as any one knows who has descended its eighty-nine steps to the holy cave in the interior of the mountain.¹⁵⁸ It is here that we have to look for the hero's shrine, here that from the first oracles were given and the nether powers adored.

It has been said that the Greeks, when they settled in Southern Italy and Sicily, set about linking the new-won

land with their own traditions.¹⁵⁹ But what actually occurred implies more than this ; we find everywhere a specific form in them. Italy—to the Greeks it really was a land of evening and death ; they recognized in it a chthonic world. But even more remarkable than this fact is the second one, that they originally adapted themselves completely to its ways.

2

Up to now the Greeks ¹⁶⁰ have always met us as the element, the appearance of which in the Italian sphere marks the decisive change, the turn and departure from what had gone before it. Yet, justified as is this point of view to one who overlooks history from its final issue as from a watch-tower, from a closer approach things look very different. We must emphasize the fact that the Greek character in its final, classical form only found its complete expression very slowly within the Italo-Roman development. That form was only attained by the Greeks themselves in a slow and untiring process of formation ; they, too, were unable to deny their enduring contact with the ancient Mediterranean element and long bore its signs upon them.

We have up to now no study which will realize for us the age and stratification of the individual cults in the Greek cities of Italy and Sicily. It seems indeed to be highly questionable, whether in the present scantiness of our knowledge such an attempt could be made with any prospect of success. So much, however, must be evident, that with the beginnings of Greek colonization on Italian soil we are in a time when the divine world of Homer, that is to say, the characteristic, classical expression of the Greek spirit in the realm of religion, is only just beginning to make its way. The same must hold good of these colonies, too ; it even seems as if the process here took place even more hesitatingly and slowly.

Coming to details, we find that the oldest layer of Greek colonization, which sets in with the foundation of Cumae, bears a very distinct and unitary character. Apart from Naxos ¹⁶¹ and Rhodian Gela ¹⁶² all the immigrants come from the motherland ; there is not a single foundation from

Asia Minor and Ionia. To quote the actual names, it is the Achaeans from the Peloponnese, then the Corinthians and Megarians, the Spartans, the Chalcidians and Locrians, who are the chief participants.

We must expect, therefore, from the first, that it will not be the gods of the native of Asia Minor, Homer, but those of the motherland, which remained on an older, vastly less advanced level, that will come most into prominence. Impressive from this point of view in the picture that offers itself to us in the Achaean Posidonia.

Here we are in a position to survey in some measure the chronological sequence of the cults. The city was founded at about the turn of the sixth century; yet it was a whole century later before the cult of Zeus reached an importance, that made it appear fitting to erect a monumental shrine (the so-called temple of Ceres). But at that time the temple of the Argive Hera ¹⁸³ had long been standing at the mouth of the Silarus; excavations have revealed remains of a building of the sixth century and, according to the view of the ancients, the shrine was actually founded by Jason (Strabo, 6, p. 252; Pliny, *n. h.* 8, 70). In the city, likewise, the other two temples had long been standing, before that of Zeus was erected, not to speak of the still older round building, which was found in front of one of them and which may also be claimed as a temple.

But to whom did these older temples belong? The attribution of the earlier to a definite deity is at present regarded as uncertain; the finds of terracotta ornamentation ¹⁸⁴ on the beams, that have been made, actually leave it open to question whether we have to think of Poseidon or of Demeter and Kore. But the separation into two of the 'cella' by a line of columns drawn through its length commends the idea of a divine pair, that is to say of the two goddesses just mentioned, as the powers there worshipped.¹⁸⁵ And the temple of the Mycenaean age, recently discovered under the Telesterion at Eleusis, seems so far to confirm this, as there, too, a building dedicated to Demeter and Kore shows a similar hall, divided down its length by a middle row of columns.¹⁸⁶ If Poseidon, as one might guess from the name of the city, stood beside the two goddesses from the first, it was only as *σύνναος* of

the goddesses, that is to say, in a secondary and subordinate position, such as belonged by right to the husband of the earth-goddess.¹⁶⁷ Only later, it seems, did he win such importance that about the middle of the sixth century a house of his own, the second of the great temples of Poseidonia, was assigned to him.

Here, then, the conditions are fairly plain. At the beginning stands the worship of Hera, who, here as in Argos, bears the pomegranate,¹⁶⁸ the fruit of Hades, and by her side the goddesses of earth and underworld. Originally as their companion, later in an independent position appears the old god of the depths of earth. Only after a long interval follows the lord of Olympus, and, indeed, at a time when the glory of the city was already beginning to wane and the Lucanian conqueror already stood at the gates.

The hill of the citadel of Cumae may suggest similar ideas. Here were set two temples on the Trachyt rock which rises on the shore, west of the Phlegraeen hill; in the east the temple of Apollo, more to the west and on the brow of the citadel that of Zeus. The excavations, although long since concluded, have not yet been published. We do, however, know that both shrines show the same layers of construction.¹⁶⁹ Of the Apollo temple we know further that its terracottas reach as early as the beginning of the sixth century.¹⁷⁰ The conclusion is probably justified, then, that the beginnings of the temple of Zeus, too, are to be placed in the same age.¹⁷¹

We may say, then, that the Olympian deities here had gained importance no slight period of time earlier than in the neighbouring city south of the Silarus. But in Cumae, too, the earlier stratum, comprising the goddesses of the earth, is unmistakable. The temple of Apollo rises on a terrace, which lies above the famous cave of the Cumaean Sibyl. Lycophron, or rather Timaeus, is the first to mention her and in the following times the wonders that there took place were most variously reported.¹⁷² The excavations have revealed the system of galleries and passages which was connected with the cave proper.¹⁷³ Whether strata going back to the beginnings of the city's foundation were found there escapes my knowledge. But even without special

evidence we must regard the worship of the goddess who dwells in the depths of earth ¹⁷⁴ and sends her prophecies thence as quite primitive. Whether or no the Oscans, who, to judge by the evidence of their graves, were settled on the rocks of the citadel before Grecian times, ¹⁷⁵ worshipped her under one name or other, here, if anywhere, we may say that a *numen* seems to haunt the spot. ¹⁷⁶ Moreover the Roman evidence reveals a very early activity of the Sibyl ¹⁷⁷ and shows not only that she was connected from of old with Apollo, ¹⁷⁸ but also that she was once the principal partner in that alliance. ¹⁷⁹ It was only from the beginning of the sixth century that the god won his enhanced position; it was then that the temple was built in his honour above and dominating the cave of the Sibyl.

So far we have thought only of Greek colonization. But it was not only in this way that the stream of Greek influence reached the bounds of Italy. In many cases it took other, independent paths.

3

The legend of Aeneas in Italy, as has recently been demonstrated, ¹⁸⁰ passed through many stages. In the company of the Elymian immigrants from Asia Minor the hero first reached Sicily and from there pushed north to Rome; the stages of his wanderings may still be recognized in the fact, that figures from the same cycle of saga are firmly established along the west coast of Italy (Palaemon, Misenus, Caieta).

This took place in the course of the fifth century. Older still was the appearance of Odysseus in Italy. Even in Rome Odysseus is an early figure. All the more significant is it that he cannot have got there by means of the Homeric epic. The form of the name, Ulixes, shows that possibly the Messapians, certainly Illyrian tribes, were the intermediaries. Their homes were in the immediate neighbourhood of the home of Odysseus. ¹⁸¹

The picture is completed if we add that Greek influences came in not only from the south of the peninsula, but also from the extreme north-east, again through the agency of the Illyrians. The case is perhaps still far from ripe for discussion. But the close and ancient connexion of the

Illyrians of the Balkans with the Greek tribes that wander in from the north into their territories,¹⁸² the manifold problems associated with the finds of Trebenischte,¹⁸³ and many similar facts already suggest much food for thought. For the Italian cult of Dionysos, in particular, much new light, it seems, may come in future from this quarter,¹⁸⁴ and the cult of the heavenly twins, too, the sons of Zeus, the Dioscouri, may be amplified from this side. This cult, one of the earliest foreign cults in Italy, which appears in Rome, if not in the age of the first calendar, at least immediately after it,¹⁸⁵ is not only widespread here, but undergoes a peculiarly extensive modification. Everywhere we meet the two gods, either with their individual names, or as sons of Zeus (Pelignian *ioviōis puclois*, dat. pl.; Marsian *ioviēs pucles*; Etruscan *tinas cliniar*),¹⁸⁶ or, in the peculiar Roman form, as Castores;¹⁸⁷ everywhere, too, there is a female deity at their side.¹⁸⁸ The way of their origin from the Greek South, especially from Tarentum, has long since been demonstrated. It has not yet been observed that in the north-east, too, in Nesazio, the centre of the Istrian Castellieri-culture, very archaic representations of the same deities (again in conjunction with a feminine consort) have been found. Their ithyphallic form is a peculiarity which points at once to Illyrian origin.¹⁸⁹ The Dioscouri, then, appear to have come not only from the Doric metropolis of the south, but also from the exactly opposite quarter, over the Timavus, into Italy.

Special attention is demanded by Messapus or Metabus,¹⁹⁰ who appears as an heroic or divine figure in middle and southern Italy. As such he belongs to the circle of Poseidon—was, in fact, originally perhaps no other than the god himself. Again the form of the name shows that he was not taken over in original form, but that he came to Italy through the intermediary of Illyrians.

But there is yet another peculiar feature. In the myth of Messapus it is not the classical form of Poseidon that is revealed; he is rather the older 'husband of the earth'; as stallion he mates with the earth-mother as mare. In the foreign field, then, was preserved an original element that Greece herself had long forgotten.

It is of high importance that it was precisely in an Illyrian

context that a peculiarly ancient form of divine representation has been preserved. It has already been shown that the linguistic connexions between Illyrians and Greeks reach back into a very early period.¹⁰¹ To this have been added the finds of Trebenischte on Lake Ochrida; ¹⁰² they have revealed the graves of a native princely caste, which in the sixth century were still laid out quite in the style of the Mycenaean 'Schacht' graves; the dead, too, wore the gold masks of Mycene. This phenomenon has been rightly interpreted as meaning that in the original home of the Mycenaean immigrants the custom lasted into a time when it had long been lost in Greece.¹⁰³ We have here just such a preservation of earlier stages and conditions, as we saw in the case of Messapus-Poseidon.

From this point of view another fact will no longer surprise us. Artemis was adopted at an early date in Italy; this is proved not only by her very ancient representation as 'queen of the beasts,' but also by the appearance of her male consort, which in the Greek sphere means a decidedly archaic trait.¹⁰⁴ For the place whence the goddess came the form of her name gives an unmistakable indication. Its oldest form (Etruscan *aritimī*), in its vocalization so distinct from the ordinary Greek, points to Asia Minor (Lydian *artimus*; 'Ἀρτίμυς as proper name).¹⁰⁵ It was not the bright figure of the Homeric poems, but the old pre-Greek goddess that first appeared in the west. She has not yet been transformed into the virgin huntress, the queen of unspoiled and free nature. It is as a demoniac power that she meets us on the earliest works of art. Inexorable and cruel, threatening and dealing destruction she is not so far removed from the Mother-Goddess of Asia Minor, and is represented like her as mistress and tamer of the beasts.¹⁰⁶

The consideration of this divine figure leads us again to the stage of 'pre-Homeric' religion, a stage at which the conception of the divine has not yet risen above the conditions of the surrounding world of the Aegean and the East, where the characteristic Greek form of that conception has not yet appeared. A similar conclusion is true of the sculptor's art.

4

To the end of the eighth century and, in part, to the beginning of the seventh belongs a group of graves in Central Italy, stretching from Vetulonia (Tomba del duce) and Marsiliana d' Albegna in the north past Caere (T. Regolini-Galassi) and Tarquinii (Bokchoris tomb) as far down as Praeneste (T. Barberini; T. Bernardini).¹⁰⁷ Their contents may be divided into three classes; one, works of Phoenician origin, ivory carvings and silver plates with low relief, often in a style copying the Egyptian; secondly, native works in the same materials, but also in gold and bronze; finally, Greek vases of the proto-Corinthian class.

The first thing in these finds to interest us is the importance of Phoenician trade. The picture is completed by the cemetery of Suessula and the pre-Greek inhumation graves of the citadel of Cumae; in them, too, Oriental finds appear.¹⁰⁸ That here, too, beside these finds the Greek vase occurs shows that the Phoenician primacy in trade was no longer uncontested. Among the Greek wares the geometric style was already introduced into Italy and widely imitated. In the change to proto-Corinthian style is reflected the foundation of Cumae. The new settlers brought with them the vases of the first proto-Corinthian style, still under geometric influence, as a novelty and began to disseminate it on the mainland.¹⁰⁹

We cannot doubt for one moment whence the elements of form in the new style spring.¹⁰⁰ If the Phoenician wares were crowded with Oriental motifs, the proto-Corinthian vases were hardly less so. Lotus flowers and papyrus stand beside the fauna of the East, lions and panthers. Then come griffins, sphinxes and similar mixed creatures, demoniac beings, winged beasts and monsters of fable. Throughout is revealed once more a rivalry with the unbridled imaginations of Eastern fancy. This early Greek art strives to equal them, and, even if up to now on Italian ground we have only the unpretentious vase-paintings to witness to this, there will certainly have been here, as we can actually prove there were in the Greek East, costly productions to challenge the work of the Eastern goldsmith.

On closer view, indeed, we find that the wealth of Oriental-

izing motifs tells us nothing about the inner form of the proto-Corinthian style. The taking over is limited to the motifs as such, that is to say to something, which has, it is true, been borrowed as a loan from abroad, but which has had to undergo a process of transformation, in order to be duly appropriated.²⁰¹ That in its inner essence the new style belongs to Greek art is at once proved by the fact that it can only be understood as the opposite to the geometric style. The liberation from that style is expressed in a livelier delight in its subjects, but also in the choice of forms themselves, in curves and bendings, in artificially intertwined shapes of plants and in a richness of colour till then unknown.

Towards the close of the seventh century the Corinthian style began to find expression in another direction. Legend preserves the memory of this, in making the Bacchiad Demaratus, when forced to flee from his home to Italy, exercise a decisive influence on the oldest Etruscan culture (Cic., *de rep.* 2, 34; Tac., *ann.* 11, 14). He is said to have introduced the alphabet and to have brought Greek artists with him; nor is it an accident that he is credited with having assisted the rise of the plastic art in terracotta, in Etruria (Plin., *n. h.*, 35, 152), for it was for this very form of art that his native city was renowned.²⁰² The way taken by Corinthian terracottas to reach the West is clearly enough seen from the metopes and frontal tiles of Corfu,²⁰³ Thermus²⁰⁴ and Calydon, where pieces with the notices in ancient Corinthian script²⁰⁵ and language have come to light. Nor can we fail to mark the agreement with the Campanian roof-terracottas of S. Angelo in Formis; ²⁰⁶ the intermediary here can have been none other than the neighbouring Cumae, whose own creations are preserved in a few examples at least.²⁰⁷

A remarkable find of the last few years enables us to go one step farther; I mean the metope with the rape of the woman, which has been found in the temple of Hera on the Silarus, mentioned above.²⁰⁸ It goes back to the beginning of the sixth century and is therefore earlier than the metopes of the temple C of Selinus; it is, in fact, the oldest plastic metope known.²⁰⁹ In its flat, board-like form, which renounces any inner grouping of the figures and leaves the

suggestion of it to the painting, it expresses its relation to the oldest metopes of Thermus, which, to judge from their early Corinthian style, may belong even to the seventh century.²¹⁰

Finally, there is a third group of finds, to which we must briefly turn our attention. Just as the proto-Corinthian vessels, while borrowing their models from Oriental art, yet make it serve their own sense of form, so is the same true of the creations of the work of the native goldsmith.

In the bronze works of the Villanova age we already note that an effect of painting is sought after. If we look at one of the bronze helmets, characteristic of that age, it is neither the ancient Oriental feeling for volume nor a feeling for architectural structure that is expressed, but an optical element. The regular interchange of light and shade, a flashing and vanishing, that we must assume for the surface in its original brilliant state, has given this piece its individual character.²¹¹

This impression is confirmed, when we look at the native metal-work from the above-mentioned graves of the seventh century. Again the optical principle enjoys the place of honour. A powerful rendering of the profile, a wealth of single plastic shapes again produces a lively and varying play of light and shaded portions. Half-shades are avoided, everything is made to depend on the sharp contrast of bright and dark.²¹² Whereas in earlier times this effect was produced by a powerful use of bosses in ornamentation or by a system of smaller points and lines, in the early archaic works it is the human and animal figure that comes to the fore.²¹³ It is brought into Italian art by import from abroad, above all by the Phoenicians; but that art employs it just as it had dealt with its own, unfigured system of ornament. These series of figures are made to carry on the same optical play, the appearance of which was distinctive from the first.²¹⁴

And here one final fact may find its place, the fact, I mean, that within the area with which we have been dealing the use of the Latin language on inscriptions can now for the first time be proved. This marks, indeed, no more than a beginning, a tentative advance out of an alien domain. But it remains noteworthy that the fibula of Praeneste, which bears that inscription, belongs to

a treasure of Phoenician gold-work in Orientalizing style ; that one of the four words that make up the inscription is an Etruscan proper name ; finally, that, to write it, an alphabet derived from the Greek was employed.²¹⁵ In such a foreign environment did the language that was to rule the world first venture into the light.²¹⁶

Chapter II

ITALY APART FROM ROME

(a) THE ETRUSCAN PROBLEM

1

THE Etruscan civilization too has been reckoned among those of the ancient middle lands.¹ We have to do, it has been said, with the remains of an ancient Mediterranean people which, with all its receptiveness of foreign influences, still kept the kernel of its being and alone retained its pre-Indo-Germanic language down to Roman times.²

On the other hand, Etruria takes up a position distinct from all the civilizations that we have been discussing, in so far as it reveals peculiarly numerous and important relations to the East of the Mediterranean, and even to the ancient East. The case is further complicated by the intrusion of the question of historical origin. Against the theory of the origin of the Etruscans in the ancient middle lands is set the rival theory that the Etruscans were immigrants from Asia Minor.

Both derivations have been confronted since ancient times, and have been hotly contested right into modern. Today the question of origin seems likely to take up the central position in research. Arguments for and arguments against the tradition of Herodotus, which speaks of an emigration from the land of the Lydians, have been massed in plenty. If the balance has seemed lately to incline in favour of Eastern origin, yet we are still far from a final settlement.

But, quite apart from such difficulties, it cannot be our task to deal with this problem of origin. It lies outside our scope, for we exclude prehistory as such on principle. But the question of the nature of Etruria is our concern. It is a historical question, in as much as the people and its civiliza-

tion has had a long and lasting influence on the fate of Italy. The question of essence has, it is true, often been linked with that of origins. The result has been, as always when a piece of research is undertaken not as an end in itself, but as a means to other ends, that the question has not been able to be developed in its full importance.

Up to now the procedure has almost always been to try and collect from the oldest Etruscan strata numerous and varied, but also quite distinct single facts that should guarantee the asserted origin from the East in Asia Minor or from a region in the ancient middle lands. It has thus been possible to heap up agreements in ornament and furniture, in clothing and weapons, in single forms of art. And yet, what good do all these facts and special observations do us, if the main point eludes our grasp? By this I mean the realization that all this can only acquire meaning by reference to a whole, to a general form of life; a form of life, too, which should imply a definite view of the world and should thus prove itself fundamentally un- and pre-Greek.

If we are already thus directed to go beyond the few tangible facts of early Etruria, that can hardly be grasped as a part of life, and to bring in further material, this is reinforced by another consideration. It is not the case that the early age alone or even predominantly bears a specifically pre-classical character and that later centuries show a character exclusively Italian. Let us realize what this means by a few examples.

There are two forms of disposal of the dead, which were confronted with one another throughout antiquity and which struggled, with varying success, for the supremacy; the burial of the corpse and the burning of it. On Italian soil both rites appear in contrast at the very beginning of the historical period in strict geographical separation. Two absolutely different conceptions of the nature of the dead find their expression here.³

If you surrender the corpse to the dissolving and destroying might of fire, to your mind the dead has finally departed from the realm of the living. If, on the other hand, you simply leave the body undisturbed to the earth, you are supposing that it merely goes back to the place from which it came, to the bosom of mother earth. By his abode with the earth-

goddess, however, the dead has become more powerful and effective than he was in his life-time. For this reason you study to protect his place of rest, to preserve his corpse against harmful influences, to send with him his favourite gear, finally to conciliate him with offerings.

This attitude of mind was exaggerated by the Etruscans over and beyond the practices we have named to the monumental scale. The dead with them are a mighty power, that strikes deep into the activities of the living. Offerings of blood are the rule, nor does one even shrink from human sacrifice at the grave; it was from these that the gladiatorial shows that spread over the whole of Italy took their rise.⁴ With the great, whole treasures were buried in their place of rest. But still mightier and more impressive, even in our time, are the cemeteries as such; no less a man than Bachofen was led by the sight of them to what proved to be his essential life-work.

If we have already been reminded by the gladiatorial games of the bloody funeral games that occur in pre-Homeric Greece and elsewhere in the Aegean,⁵ the memory is rendered vivid by the lay-out of these cemeteries. The piled grave-mounds, the inner chambers with 'false' vaulting, above all the durability and greatness of the buildings, recall the corresponding works of the culture of Mycenae or of western Asia Minor. We are directly reminded of the Lydian cemetery of Sardes or of the Egyptian cities of the dead, when in Etruria a closed city of the dead rises by the side of that of the living.⁶ In Caere it takes up the whole of a hill; fortified like the city itself, it stretches wide, covered with numberless grave-mounds and chambers and crossed by roads and passages, which combine to form a regular network.

Here, then it seems, is revealed a close contact with the early civilizations of the East. But we must stress the fact that the decisive element in this contact—the city of the dead as a very city, conceived of as a closed and regular world of its own—is not ancient in Etruria; on the contrary, it represents the latest stage of development. In Caere it can be established that the development of a regular system of streets, by which a conglomeration of graves really becomes a city, is an undertaking of the fourth to third century.⁷ And

yet in itself the regular network of streets, cutting one another at right angles in the style of Hippodamus, appears considerably earlier, for example at Marzabotto.⁸

Even, then, if we have in this type of city of the dead a genuine criterion of pre-Greek character, (and I imagine we may assert this with confidence) yet Etruria will not have shown it from the first. Only gradually can it have grown up into the form destined for it, expressing that form with ever increasing distinctness, just like a man, in whom the really characteristic features can only be recognized at the height of his development. The germs, it is true, may have been placed there in the early time, the seed may have been received, but that this was so is only shown in this case by the later ripening.

A second example will make this clear. We all know those monuments with numerous figures of demons, which for many denote the very character of Etruscan religion. Winged creatures with the most varied attributes, grotesque and awe-inspiring figures, blending human and animal forms, are as alien to the Greece of classical times as they are reminiscent of the similar monstrosities produced by the ancient East and the world of Mycenae and Crete. Indeed, in this common contrast to the Greek conception of the divine, scholars have seen a connecting link between the Etruscans of the West and the ancient civilizations of the East.⁹

And yet it is again the fact, that that peculiarity by no means appears in Etruria at the outset. There is, indeed, not a complete lack of demons, but other elements, especially the 'great' gods borrowed from the Greeks, are vastly more prominent. Only gradually, only in the later centuries, do these demoniac creatures appear in mass, overgrowing all else beside.¹⁰ For example, a figure as important for the Etruscan conception of death as Charon does not appear before the fourth century.¹¹

Once again we see, that, although in itself the recorded origin of the Etruscans might provoke such a conclusion, the traits related to the Eastern world, the ancient Mediterranean traits, are by no means to be found at the beginning of the development. Rather, it seems, Etruria, as a late-comer among the ancient peoples, ran for itself a course long

completed elsewhere. The fact is the exact opposite of what the naïve identification of the question of origin with that other question of essential connexion with the Aegean and ancient Eastern sphere might lead us to assume. We have not an original connexion with the East in prehistoric or early historical times, followed by a rapid divergent development in the following centuries; it is precisely in the sequel, in the strictly historical centuries that we find an ever more emphatic growth towards the given form, which was rather promised than actually presented by the Eastern origin, be it imaginary or real.

Similar facts may be noted for the appearance of extispicy in Etruria.¹² Attention has always been drawn to agreements between the Etruscan and the ancient Eastern doctrine; they can be followed in detail on the surviving models of livers.¹³ But, whereas in the East the earliest model of the kind goes back to the time of the first dynasty of Babylon, and the evidences in the texts are not very far behind it, the Etruscan bronze liver of Piacenza cannot be placed earlier than the second century.¹⁴ The representation of an haruspex on an urn for ashes at Volterra takes us no farther back.¹⁵ Again we realize the curious fact, that complete agreement on the Etruscan side is relatively late to appear.¹⁶

We will not now illustrate the special meaning of the resulting view by further detailed instances. Its fruitfulness will only be revealed, when we succeed by its help in advancing towards its solution a question hitherto discussed with more or less lack of success. With this intention let us select the position of women within the Etruscan order of society. Though at the first glance it may seem to represent only one detail the more, it will soon lead us beyond the question as we have so far put it and will enable us to gain an inclusive picture of Etruscan form.

2

Since J. J. Bachofen took the field, it has been common form to speak of 'mother-right' in Etruria. Here, as always, he has succeeded in applying an extensive collection of material to his thesis and has not confined himself to Etruria

proper, but has brought into consideration the Rome of the kingly period and much beside. His *Tanaquil* is an attempt to present in one magnificent picture the great theme of world history, the fight between mother- and father-right, which for Bachofen coincided with that between blood and spirit, between a state without history and historical existence.

His thoughts have worked after him in the most diverse forms. Acceptance of Bachofen and criticism of him are most vividly contrasted. Even the circles of narrow specialists, which have driven the revolt from him farthest, have always now and again felt obliged to adopt one or other of his conclusions. Wissowa himself has had the courage to declare that the prayer of the Roman matrons to Mater Matuta, in which they took thought for the children of their sisters before their own, represented the recollection of a kind of relationship distinct from father-right.¹⁷ Kornemann, too, even if he did not consider the possibility of direct influence from Etruria, yet supposed that he could trace the results of the same prehistoric civilization of the middle lands, of which Etruria as much as the civilization of the pre-Greek world or that of the ancient East, formed a part.¹⁸

Since then, it is true, this point has become doubtful. The Roman goddess has been assigned with certainty to the circle of Dionysos, and, with that, the prayer, too, has had to receive a different explanation.¹⁹ Of the other evidences for Etruscan mother-right very little seems to be left. Above all, the figure of Tanaquil, which for Bachofen was central and still is for many of his adherents, has had to give up her place and to accept a position in another context.²⁰

My essay deliberately neglects the question whether there ever was a mother-right in the strict sense, a matriarchy or a rule of women, or whatever we choose to call it, in Etruria. This way of putting the question has long enough narrowed the horizon of research and, much to its disadvantage, hindered it from examining the facts without prejudice. Especially since ethnology has set about submitting the question of mother-right to revision from its own resources, and regarding the case from an entirely new point of view,²¹ the last reason for clinging to the old way of posing the question vanishes. Here, then, in quite general terms the position of woman in Etruria and inside Etruscan society shall be the subject of our study.

On the sepulchral inscriptions of Etruria one peculiarity

is well known which has no analogies elsewhere in Italy and which has therefore from the first attracted attention; I mean, the mention of the descent of the dead on the mother's side.²² This is done either by giving the gentile name of the mother together with the praenomen of the father (either in the first or in the second place) or, in other cases, by giving it alone. The late Etrusco-Latin bilinguals (and the Latin inscriptions of Etruscan territory, too) at least enable us to realize fully the state of the case.

How then are we to interpret it? It was bound at once to occasion surprise that it was precisely the later inscriptions, in which the maternal origin was stated. For the earlier age, on the contrary, it seems as if no certain evidence can be adduced. These observations are of considerable importance for the question as we have raised it, but they may have to be discounted first. Attempts have also been made to diminish the curious quality of the evidence by thinking of birth out of wedlock, where only the mother's name appears, or by supposing that preference is given to the woman as a matter of 'courtesy'; again perhaps in some cases a free-born woman may be named before an enfranchised male.²³ This last argument, however, fails to satisfy. If father-right were consistently carried through, the woman would have of necessity to pass into the rank of her husband; the free woman by her marriage with a freedman would be degraded to his status and her former precedence would be forfeited. If, then, on the contrary this precedence is retained, nay, even expressly emphasized on the inscriptions, the fact at once indicates social conceptions of a quite different character.

We may add a further consideration. We find two parallel forms, in which the descent of the dead is given, one from both parents, the other from the mother only. As in the rest of Italy it is only descent on the father's side that is mentioned, the designation by name of the mother is at once marked as something specifically Etruscan, as a local peculiarity. Even if, as we have said, it is late to appear on the inscriptions, something essential is involved therein, as may be proved from another side, by a figure in Etruscan legend.

If we bring legend into our discussion, this is based on

grounds of principle. Legend for us, so far from being an indifferent or frivolous invention, means in certain stages of history one of our most important means of learning the truth. The emphasis here is not to be laid on the fact that it preserves relics of old or the oldest conditions. Rather it represented, so long as it was living, so long as its content was unbroken, nothing else than an ideal picture of life itself, that is to say, a picture raised to the level of the significant and the normal. It is not a picture of a dream-world, in which one takes refuge from reality, but the transformation and enhancement of it in the direction of the ideal of that which ought to be.

This once granted, it becomes at once highly significant that descent exclusively from the mother actually inlets us in Etruscan legend. It has been observed that such descent is never emphasized in the case of an Homeric hero (Aristonicus on A 709; Apollon., *Lexic.* s. v. *Φοῖβος* p. 164, 11).²⁴ On the contrary, an Etruscan hero appears as son of a divine mother and only so.²⁵ We refer to **Herulus* or, as he is called in our tradition, *Erylus* (*Erylus*) of Praeneste; ²⁶ he is the son of Feronia, that is, of the earth-mother,²⁷ who gave him his three lives (Vergil, *Aen.* 8, 563 f.). He belongs, then, to the rank of those heroes, who appear like Geryoneus in threefold form or with three sets of limbs, such as Ajax, son of Oileus, possessed according to Servius Dan., *Aen.*, 1, 41.²⁸ For the circle of Etruscan civilization the age of this conception is proved by archaic art ²⁹ and to it Herulus himself belongs. This is shown both by his localization at Praeneste, permeated from of old with Etruscan influences, and by the formation of his name.³⁰ We have here beyond doubt an authentic piece of tradition, the evidential quality of which must not be questioned.

The more important is the absence of descent on the father's side; this appearance of a hero as the son of his mother takes its place by the side of the sepulchral inscriptions and proves once more that the mention of descent through the mother is a specifically Etruscan form. To confirm this we may adduce the fact that this parallelism of the human and the divine sphere recurs a second time under similar conditions. On Olympus there is one single god, whose descent is given on the mother's side: the son of Leto, Apollo (*Ἀητωίδης*). It has long since been called to mind ³¹ that he is originally no Greek, but a native of Asia Minor. In Lycia, where Leto

too belongs ⁸² is his home,⁸³ and there again it is the case that the mortal man is named after his mother.⁸⁴ Again, as in Etruria, human and divine order are in agreement.

Before, however, we proceed to use our results for the question which we have posed, we must make one more reserve. We have already indicated that those inscriptions, on which the use of the name of the mother has been observed, are of late or very late origin; the legend of Herulus, indeed, might demand an earlier age, but for the time it stands by itself. But not only is our material late, the evidence which it presents appears only in an imperfect and inconsequential form. The mention of the name of the mother on sepulchral inscriptions is indeed common, but by no means a matter-of-course and regular peculiarity. No less than that, however, could be assumed for an institution that would deserve the name of mother-right in the strict sense. Rather, that very uncertainty, that irregularity in the use of the metronymic shows that it is question not of a right, but, at most, of a widespread practice, a generally accepted custom. Even such a custom, however, may lead us to the feeling that underlies the construction of the order of the family, to the position of woman in it—or at least may give us a pointer to show where the right solution is to be looked for.

Let us ask in a perfectly general way, what must be the appearance of an order of society in which children may be required to feel themselves as the descendants of their mother and not of their father. What binds the children to their mother is the feeling that they are flesh of her flesh, blood of her blood. It is this common blood, then, by which they are linked and which makes them enter into a certain opposition to their father and begetter.

If we follow up the path on which we have entered, the question forces itself on us, what further consequences result for an order of society which thus raises the blood to the position of decisive factor.⁸⁵ So much appears plain, that the wife and mother on her side too will assign more importance to connexions by blood than to those with her husband and father of her children. She would feel herself a member of her native clan; she would remain most intimately connected with her parents, brothers, and cousins and would

recognize in their company, not in the clan of her husband, the place to which she by her origin belongs.

In practical use this means, that the woman does not marry into the clan of her husband, but that she remains, where by blood descent she belongs. It is not she, but the man who passes into the strange company. It is the woman, then, not the 'pater familias' of the Roman order, who is bearer and centre of the family. The husband is a factor, necessary indeed, but secondary. He is begetter of children or lover, as the case may be, but never the decisive, not to say the unrestricted, head of the family.

So far, this seems to be a mere ideal reconstruction, no more. Let us therefore reflect and ask, whether and where in Etruria traces of such an order are to be found. In actual fact, quite distinct results seem to be obtainable and, in this case, our material is such that we can establish by it a regular and consistently observed rule.

In the necropolis of Caere, R. Mengarelli has been able to prove a series of chamber-graves of the fourth to first century which show a highly pronounced peculiarity in the separation of male and female dead.³⁶ While the women are marked by columns in the form of a house or of a house-sarcophagus, the men receive notice in the shape of a pillar. Mengarelli has already observed that the consistent execution of this distinction excludes any thought of chance, that we must rather seek in the house something that denotes the woman as such. The thought lies near, that this house represents the place and field of activity of the woman, and that that is why this particular form of column is chosen for her.³⁷ If this idea should be correct, we must expect that the pillar on the other hand expresses a conception that is not less characteristic of the man than the house was of the woman. In Mengarelli's view the pillar represented a rudimentary form of the human shape; in proof of this, he reminds us of two red-figure vases, on which above the grave of the dead a similar pillar is erected, in one case crowned on the analogy of the human figure with a helmet. So too the pillars of Caere are crowned with a wreath; there too the agreement with the man appears.³⁸

On a closer view it is seen that only in the rarest cases

do the columns deserve the name of pillars. They are low, cylindrical blocks, without capital or any proper basis. Rather does the base on which they stand slowly and imperceptibly grow into the cylinder.³⁹ Remarkable, too, is a thickening in the form of a knob that occasionally appears at the top; ⁴⁰ this must, I imagine, really show with what we have to do. These columns are a special form of the funereal monuments that appear everywhere and from early times in the circle of Etruscan civilization 'in forma di pigna' or 'in forma spheroidale' ^{40a} and, like them, are nothing but phalli.⁴¹ The very ornament of the wreath speaks in favour of this view; we need only remind the reader of the picture on a mirror ⁴² and of the wreathing of the Lanuvian phallus (Varro in August., *De civ. Dei* 7, 24).

The funereal columns in form of pillars, then, are funereal phalli, such as meet us, for example, in Asia Minor,⁴³ and this explains at a stroke why precisely this form was chosen for the designation of the male dead. But what of the house by the side of the phallus? This, too, may be understood, if we remember another arrangement that again meets us in Italy.

In Epizephyrian Locri the nobles, as Aristotle reported (in *Polyb.* 12, 5-8), were grouped in the so-called 'hundred houses'. This order was already in vogue in the home of the city, the Locri of central Greece, and we may surely connect with this the fact that the Opuntians there collected their men capable of bearing arms in the assembly of the 'thousand'.⁴⁴ But what concerns us more is the obvious identification of 'house' (*oikia*) and 'clan', there carried out. We remember that in the name of the Dorians, *τρίχαιες* from **τρίχα-fixes* ⁴⁵, the three tribes are likewise designated as 'houses'; yet just in the case of these tribes the gentile character is certainly not conceived of as original.⁴⁶ Rather we may think of those 'sons of the houses' (Middle Persian *vis-pukragān*), that is to say of the members of those seven clans (avest. *vis-*, early Persian *vip-* (Shorn) cp. p. 13 l. 27 = *oikos*, *φαῖκος*), which form the nobility of Iran under the Sassanids.⁴⁷

The second peculiarity, which meets us in the south Italian Locri, is that those hundred houses went back to female ancestors. These were, as Pindar emphasizes (*Olymp.* 9, 56), mortal women, who once in the home Locri had enjoyed the society of gods; ⁴⁸ according to Polybius (12, 5, 8), their graves were still in some cases shown. These female ancestors, then, are, for their part, in the closest connexion with the houses and with this we find the relation to what we had observed at Caere.

Here, as there, 'house' and 'woman' are connected. In Locri this house denoted the clan and the heroines are ancestresses. In Caere, however, we can prove, what has nothing to correspond with it on the Locrian side,⁴⁰ that these women are not merely ancestresses, but also the representatives of the clan or 'house' that are valid for each generation and are present in it. Or, to put it more precisely, the women are, as the funereal columns show, the house itself. The conception seems to have been so immediately obvious that it could be directly translated into plastic form.

The question of age requires a special note. In the case of the evidence so far adduced we must always remember their later origin. In Caere, too, the case seems, at first glance at least, to be the same. For those funereal columns in the form of houses, on which our argument rests, belong for the greater part to no earlier date than the fourth to third century. And yet it is precisely Caere that opens up a view of earlier times.

Mengarelli has already emphasized the fact that some certain pieces, even if only a few, go back to a much earlier date. Like the type of house itself⁴⁰ which they represent, the columns too go back to the beginning of the Villanova age. For among the 'Pozzo' and ditch graves, that is to say among the earliest appurtenances of the cemetery,⁴¹ the graves of women are already denoted in this form.⁴² In the case of the grave-tumuli and the chamber-graves too, the observation may be made, that, among the stone resting-places for the dead here buried, the female are always marked by the choice of the form of a house sarchophagus.⁴³

The result is a somewhat altered and, as it appears to me, very clear picture. With the view that the woman is the house itself, that is to say, the representative of the family, we get back to the earliest days of Etruscan settlement. This it was that furnished the kernel and centre of the whole circle of ideas. The result that must follow—I mean, that the children belong to the mother and not to the father—may in its roots go back as far, at least, as a more or less clearly defined feeling. But it took centuries for this feeling to create for itself a visible expression.

In the position of woman we have seen once more that the institutions, in which scholars have tried to detect contact with the Eastern world of the Aegean and Asia Minor, only developed in their fullness, at least, in late times. But we must not rest content with this confirmation of results already gained. The relation of man to woman is too important, too vital in the various forms it may take for the inner life of a people, for us to omit the attempt to reach a more exact classification of Etruria on this point of history.

Let us begin with the Etruscan man. We have now confirmed the guess we first made, that within the family he is regarded as an element that intrudes from outside. From the woman, as representative of the house and family, he is, in Caere at least, plainly distinguished. He is something distinct from the house, something that exists outside it and apart from it, and can even, as we have seen, enter into a certain opposition to it. The male part, then, means something added to the family from outside, not something permanently connected with it, still less that in which the family, whether as a contemporary whole or in the succession of generations, finds its manifestation.

Perhaps we must advance yet one more step. What does the phallus in this context mean? As symbol it is only intelligible if we see in it at least an important and indeed a vital function of the man, as husband and begetter of offspring. Certainly—but in my view it is far from clear that this function by itself alone is meant. We must reckon with the possibility, that, here as elsewhere in the pre-Homeric world, the phallus is the expression of the male in general; that in it the male is manifested in its whole range.⁵⁴

If we apply this conception to the Etruscan grave phalli, we find a perhaps even more far-reaching result. For Caere and its cult of the dead the man appears not merely as begetter, but as everything outside the 'house'. In this setting, we must infer, he does not appear as head and leader of the clan, does not even in the strict sense belong to it. Certainly, there is no trace of the decided position of the man as *pater familias*, which is so strongly developed in Roman cult.⁵⁵

The picture which Etruscan thought made of the family can now, it seems, be drawn, at least in its general outlines. The whole peculiarity of this picture, however, is only revealed when we bring the Roman custom into comparison with it from another point of view. In Rome it is the conception of the *genius* in which the idea of the continuity of the family finds its expression. This genius is not only the divine power of procreation, which in the individual case begets new life, but means also, as has been observed, a simile for the male seed, which from the father begets the son and from the son goes on to continue the race. The one and same seed that was in the father is in the son and will continue to be in the grandchildren and further generations.⁶⁶ Here we have the sharpest conceivable contrast. It is not in the women, but in the men that the family is perpetuated. It is simply a necessary inference from this, that in Rome the woman, by marriage, passes from her own family into that of her husband, passes from the *potestas* of her father into that of her husband.

This contrast of the two conceptions found its grandest, because conscious and deep-going expression, in the *Eumenides* of Aeschylus. There too appears the irreconcilable conflict between two worlds of thought,⁶⁷ depending on the way in which each realizes the relation of man and wife, of father and mother. Whilst the goddesses appeal to the tie of blood that links son and mother in contrast to the husband,⁶⁸ Apollo sets against it a picture that is completely different in shape and yet no whit less impressive. Only the begetter, the man, that is to say, deserves the name of *τοκεύς*. The mother is no more than nurse and caretaker of the seed committed to her, which, as a stranger, she has to foster and bring up (658 f.) ; finally, we may add, the father is entitled to demand back from her the property entrusted to her charge. This conception has actually been dismissed as a mere quibble, but is only the logical expression of what is revealed in the Roman point of view too. It is, of course, a decidedly male idea,⁶⁹ as its utterance from the lips of Apollo shows. But this very fact leads us to what lies at the root of all the talk about father- and mother-right, which are far from being mere legal phrases, to the contrast between a

male and a female conception of the world as a whole. Here, as everywhere in the strife between the Eumenides and Apollo,⁶⁰ this contrast is revealed. For, if we speak of this as a specifically male conception, so may we speak of the other as a specifically female, which counts the natural connexion between child and mother, between sister and brother, as offspring of the same womb, which, to put it in general terms, counts the blood as the decisive factor.

The fact that the conception of the Etruscans, if we have rightly grasped it, takes its place by that of the Eumenides in Aeschylus, supplies us with an indication of decisive importance. These goddesses not merely represent the right of a natural order, that is to say, of a female, they are also thereby the champions of a world that precedes the Olympian, the world of the gods of Homer; in the mighty pictures, conjured up by the imagination of the poet, this dead world is again brought to life. The natural inference—that the Etruscans in their essence belong to the pre-Homeric, pre-classical civilization of the middle lands—is in full agreement with what we have already divined from single examples. Nowhere, maybe, has that which we called nature in this context, that is to say, the conception and ordering of the world not by the spirit, but by the elementary, driving forces, found so clear an expression.

4

The importance of these facts for the relationship of Etruria to Greek civilization is at once clear. It is well-known, and we shall find it confirmed in detail, that the Etruscans borrowed elements of Greek civilization on the grand scale, that they even came to carry out and extend them. If, in spite of this, they never reached that deeper appropriation and inner realization of those elements that we shall meet in the case of Rome, the cause must lie in that peculiarity of the Etruscan form, which has been displayed to us. Let us briefly make this clearer in a definite direction.

The circumstance that the conception of the *genius* as the begetter of the individual life is common to Etruscans and Romans, does not exclude differences in detail.⁶¹ Rather

do these details claim a particular interest, when we try to discover the peculiar traits of the character of Etruria. Dedicatory inscriptions from Falerii have furnished as local name of the deity the word * *titos*, and that tells us at once with what we have to do.⁶² The Etruscan *genius* was a phallus and therewith its relations with the phallic grave-monuments, or with Mutinus Titinus,⁶³ the god with the Etruscan name and the phallic form, as well as with many legends, are at once explained. Important is the point that we have everywhere in thought and representation to do with an elementary, physical principle; the circumstance of natural sex in the idea is not merely not avoided, it is deliberately emphasized.

On the other hand, although the name of the Roman *genius* does indeed mean the 'begetter', and although the function of a divine force, which works in and beside the human father, is everywhere the same,⁶⁴ yet the Roman *genius* is far removed from any relation to the sexual in its narrower sense, not to speak of its ever being conceived or expressed in phallic form. It is always the thought of life generally, of the laughing, happy element, filled with his presence, that is connected with the god.⁶⁵ The realm of the merely physical is as deliberately ennobled and surpassed here, as it was retained there.

Both as matter of fact and of principle we may link on here one of those observations about the position and importance of the Etruscan woman, especially in the realm of the family and society, which we have already made. We stumbled on a peculiar sanctification of the blood-tie, making the married woman nearer to her kinsmen than to her husband, the children to their mother than to their father. Now, if the connexion of the family is based on the blood and on it alone, that must mean that it rests on something physical, on something almost material. Once again, this is a purely natural and matter-of-fact connexion divorced from any spiritual principle. In harmony with this the man is expressed as a merely physical entity. Regarded from the point of view of the order of the family, he is primarily the begetter of offspring, with the physical qualification for this end; therefore there can be no better likeness for him

than the phallus. The phallus is the perfect expression of a bursting and indestructible energy.

It is unmistakable that, by virtue of their central place within the order of the family, the Etruscan women claimed a far larger share in public life than was, for example, allowed the Greek woman. Our Greek authorities report feasts which they shared with the men, and the right to toast any boon-companion. And, whereas at Olympia it was forbidden all women (with the exception of the priestess of Demeter Chamyne) under penalty of death even to look on at the races of the naked men (Paus. 6, 20, 9,) and whereas Augustus issued a like edict (Suet., *Aug.* 44, 3), a picture on a fresco in the Stackelberg tomb shows the exact reverse. The men are set to strive for the prize before the eyes of female spectators too.⁶⁶ Nor do these fail by gestures of the hand to spur on and distinguish the men. Or, take another picture. In the tomb of the 'Triclinio' we see girls and youths at a dance.⁶⁷ But how different is the conduct of the two. It is a Dionysiac scene, as the ivy on the upper border shows. But it is only the girls and young women who are abandoned to the god, it is they alone who set the tone. Their movements are extravagant. In their transparent dresses (true *ἀνθὶνὰ ἱμάτια*, known to the Greek only as the dress of *hetaerae*) they offer themselves, now hiding their physical charms, now developing them to the full by a bold swaying of the hips. They allure and decoy, their abandonment rises to an ecstasy.⁶⁸ The rôle of the men, on the other hand, is secondary; they play up to the women, accompany them, admire them—but the female part alone is dominant.

A fragment of Theopompus (*Athen.* 517 D ff.; Fr. Gr., *Hist.* 2, fr. 204) tells us of the beauty of the Etruscan women; of how they showed themselves uncovered to the eyes of men and practised their physical exercises before them, of how they were not even ashamed of fighting out their gymnastic contests before them. The same report gives us the equivalent on the male side, when in the circus the naked athlete strives to show himself before the women in his strength, his ability and in all the glory of his physical training and to win distinction from them. Both sexes seem to devote all their energies to exhibiting to one another

their advantages, their physical powers or bodily charms. This leads to an extraordinary estimation of the physical as such, far beyond anything Greek, and so once again to the exaltation of the physical to be the one principle that determines the relation between man and woman.

Here, then, we meet a strange race of fair bodies, of luxurious desirous women and muscular men. The archaic art, in particular, strove to give expression to it. Unending is the charm and variety in which the Etruscan woman appears, but yet we cannot be quite happy with her. The beauty here unfolded is a physical and external beauty; here too nature seems to dictate the law. We cannot overcome the feeling, that that other beauty which we call allure, charm, grace, is missing here.

And in this nature the element of transitoriness is inherent. Here too it comes to the fore. We have already spoken of the importance, which the dead, death and the other world possess in Etruscan belief. It is from a land of vaults and graves that the Etruscan woman springs; the beyond overshadows her existence and her demon seems to derive its nourishment from those regions. She bears in herself the magic of that world, but its darkness and confusion no less. She is mighty as any goddess of the nether world; like such a one she is often the great *hetaera*, the insatiable, that draws all that she can touch into her enchantment.⁶⁰ Her beauty is depicted as supremely alluring and yet it remains no more than a beauty of the body, a body, which is goaded by the consciousness of its own transitoriness and nearness to death to a wild and intoxicating bloom.

The conception of the man, too, is different, if we measure it by Greek art. For that art the perfect, naked male form involves also the expression of something spiritual, of the claim of the human being, and of the man, in particular, by virtue of his perfection, to be the norm and centre of the *cosmos*. In spite of its extensive adoption of Greek forms, Etruscan art made them undergo a momentous change. The change affects their essential nature and all that remains is little more than a borrowing of externals. It is not the plastic shaping of the ideal that meets us in Etruscan statues. No, it is the might of the limbs, the play

and massing of the muscles, the assembled and accumulated force. Or, in other words, here too is revealed a natural existence, fettered to pure nature, which, in spite of all apparent contact, runs exactly contrary to the idea of Greece, which we call not nature, but spirit.

In general, we may say that the productions of Etruscan art are devoted to the enjoyment of a fair existence and to the delights that it can offer.⁷⁰ Everywhere it forms the counterpart to the preoccupation with death, grave and belief in demons, whether we meet it in haruspicy, necromancy or in the lore of lightning. The gladiatorial games, originally sprung from the worship of the dead, show us the passage from one idea to the other, as they, in course of time, came to be the main attraction and centre of all public games and amusements. For in the worship of the dead laughing and weeping seem to complete one another, and all games at the grave tend to display a tendency towards the exaggerated and the grotesque.⁷¹

It is a coloured picture that is unfolded on the reliefs of the cippi or on the grave-paintings. Feasting and love (*amor* is probably an Etruscan word ⁷²), dance and harp-play show us a world that turns wholeheartedly to the present. Greek influence is, indeed, strong, perhaps stronger than anywhere else, but only that is borrowed which fits in with this picture. The great creations of Greek literature, not to speak of those of Greek philosophy, never succeeded in taking root on Etruscan soil. There were the beginnings of popular drama in the 'Atellan' farce,⁷³ but, when as with this people the stage inclined to farce, so too the heroic legend degenerated into fable, into a variegated and diverse, but essentially frivolous play of fancy.

(b) THE ITALIAN BULL-GOD

It is customary to assign to the Etruscans an exceptional position in ancient Italy. We may fairly ask on what grounds and in what scope this should be done.

The Etruscans, we have seen, belong in their inward essence to a form of existence, the greatest achievements of which lay far before the historical ages of Italy. Yet they

themselves, as late-comers among the peoples of their type, only achieved their proper form in the course of those ages. Their development was completed by a long process of growth into the forms of the ancient 'middle' lands and of the ancient East. Or, to express it more sharply: their historical existence is filled by a gradual break through to such pre- and proto-historic formations, implying a re-awakening and renewal of what elsewhere was long past and gone.

It is just at this point that they come into contact with the other Italian peoples. They too display a similar growth and slow penetration towards such older, prehistoric forms in the very course of the centuries of history. So far, such phenomena have only been noted for the Illyrian peoples of Italy.⁷⁴ But there can be no doubt that they hold true for a far wider circle. Let us illustrate this point by a few examples. We begin with a phenomenon, which expresses a vital component of Italian being; with the name of the Italians and of the land of Italy itself.⁷⁵

1

Our ancient authorities agree, that the name of Italy,⁷⁶ which afterwards came to include so much, was at first restricted to the south of the peninsula.⁷⁷ Whether or no Tarentum was included, —certainly towards the end of the fifth century Campania lay outside—for Thucydides Cumæ lay in 'Ονικτα (6, 4, 5). Antiochus of Syracuse drew the boundary even more narrowly and understood under Italy essentially Bruttium, south of a line marked by the river Laus and Metapontum. But even this was only true for Antiochus's own time; he himself knew that the designation originally comprised a still smaller region, the south of the Bruttian peninsula as far as the isthmus between the Scylletian and Napetian bays (Aristot., *Polit.* 7, 10, 1329 b9f.; Dion., Hal. 1, 35, 1 f.; Strabo, 6, 254). It is here then that we must seek the earliest place of the name of Italy.

Over the etymology, too, the ancients were quite clear. They referred it to an old word *ἰταλός* or *ἰτυλός* 'head of cattle'; occasionally a definite Tyrrhenian, that is to say, native Italian origin was assigned to it (Paul Fest., p. 106 M.; Hellanicus in Dion. Hal. 1, 35, 2; Fr. Gr. Hist. 1, fr. 111; Apollod., 2, 5, 10, 10). Comparison with Latin *vitulus*, umbr., *villu*, *villuf*, *villup*, forces itself on the notice and Oscan *víteliri* 'Italia' brings confirmation.⁷⁸ It is simply the 'land of cattle.' Root and meaning recur again and again in the native names. As *vitellus* is related to *vitulus*,

so are the divine ancestors of the Vitellii, the Vitellia (Suet., *Vitell.* 1), and the Latin city of the same name connected with the same context.⁷⁹ The word reached Rome in the Greek form Italia (*Ἰταλία*) and the uncertainty over the quantity of the first syllable points to a foreign intermediary.⁸⁰

Our ancient authorities would have us further believe that it was the abundance of herds that gave rise to the name. But Bruttium offers small scope to the keeping of cattle and the south, in general, only became pasturage under the rule of the Roman oligarchy. The right explanation suggests itself at once. There can be no doubt that *Italia*, *Ἰταλία*, linguistically considered, denotes the land of the *Itali*, *Ἰταλοί*, as the supposed derivation ἀπὸ τοῦ δυναστεῦς θαντός Ἰταλοῦ really expresses (Ps.—Scymn. 302). We cannot, then, escape the conclusion that the inhabitants, after whom the land was called, styled themselves cattle. G. Devoto, who recently drew this inference,⁸¹ thought that he might deduce from it that we have to do with an expression of totemism. If this were true, we should be obliged to presuppose a kind of conception that has not yet been demonstrated on the peninsula.⁸² Perhaps another explanation may be found, which will permit us to explain the name by native Italian conceptions; if so, it may fairly be preferred to the totemistic hypothesis.

The name of Italy became, in the Social War, a political slogan, under which the Italians massed for battle with Rome. The new capital, Corfinium, received this name; the coins struck for Samnium bear it in the form *vitellini* (Planta 234–8; Conway 199 f.). As type they show the head of the god Mars or Mamers and, with him or alone, the bull; with its horns it casts to earth the she-wolf of Rome. This bull and the name of the land, which is called after 'cattle' or the 'ox', must obviously be connected. How they are connected is revealed the moment that we bring in the god Mars as a third element of the problem.

There was a time when the bull stood in very close relation to the god, nay, rather, actually represented him, just as surely as the wolf or woodpecker did.⁸³ We should observe that in the prayer *pro bubus, uti valeant* (Cato, *de agr.* 83) not only Silvanus, but also Mars is invoked. To this corresponds another fact, the proceedings at the *ver sacrum*. When a community decides to drive the youths born in a certain year beyond its frontiers, in order thus to offer them to the god, the bull appears beside the wolf and the woodpecker as the leader of the dedicated band. So too the tribe of the Hirpini, which traced its origin to such a sacred spring, called itself the 'Picentines' after the woodpecker (*picus*); the Samnites, finally, called their city after the bull that had led them, Bovianum (Strabo, 5, 240; 250; cp. the fine interpretation of Th. Mommsen, *Unterital. Dialekte* 173; Paul. Fest. p. 160; 212 M.).⁸⁴

The Hirpini, the 'wolf' folk or 'property of the wolf', are

ranged with a whole series of Italian communities, which called themselves after that animal or, actually, 'wolves'. We may refer to the Roman *luperci*, to the Apulian *Daunii*, and to the priesthood of the *hirpi Sorani*, who occasionally appear also as *hirpini*.⁸⁵ The Picentines, on the other hand, are never called just 'woodpeckers' or 'kinsmen' of the bird, but, to adopt P. Kretschmer's certain explanation of the *-nt*-suffixes,⁸⁶ the 'young woodpeckers'. With this the designation of the *Itali*, *Ἰταλοί*, as the 'cattle', seems to find its place.

Just as Umbrian distinguishes the young bull from the heifer by special masculine and feminine ending (*villu*, *villuf*, *villuf*, beside *villaf*, *villa*), so does Latin with the forms *vitulus* and *vitula*. Those *Itali*, *Ἰταλοί*, *vituli*, then, or whatever we are to call them, were, strictly speaking, not simply cattle, but young bulls. Or, to put it in a different way; just as the 'young woodpeckers' named themselves after the woodpecker of Mars (*picus Martius*) or after the god 'woodpecker' (*Picus*), so those men, we must suppose, called themselves after the bull of Mars or after the bull-god Mars himself.

The very fact that in Iguvium three *vituli tauri* (*villuf turuf*, Ib2; VIb48) are sacrificed to Mars **Hodius* confirms this conclusion; we shall have to discuss later the close connexion between the chief animal sacrificed to a god and that god's appearance in animal shape. In favour of the connexion of these *vituli* or *Itali* with Mars, we may also note that the afore-mentioned *gens Vitellia* appears as descendants of Faunus. Now Faunus belongs to the circle of Mars. As 'wolf' ⁸⁷ he cannot be separated from the *lupus Martius*; he is actually called the son of the god.⁸⁸ Not less remarkable is the name of the Vitellii, themselves. It belongs, as we have said, to *vitulus*, *vitellus* and is further developed in adjectival form, like *hirpinus* from *hirpus*, *lupercus* from *lupus*,⁸⁹ *Daunius* from *Daunus*.⁹⁰ Whether the goddess in the case, Vitellia, is to be reckoned simply as the goddess of the Vitellii, the *gens Vitellia*, and so assigned to the numerous class of the gentile deities,⁹¹ or whether we have to do with a goddess in the shape of a calf, cannot yet be decided. For the second possibility we might urge that Lupercus too was the name of the god, and not merely that of his priests.⁹² So beside the 'wolf' Faunus stand the wolf-like, 'wolfish' *Haunii* (= Faunii), as *dii agrestes* (lib. gloss.), who cannot possibly be separated from him.⁹³ Finally, we are helped to imagine a deity, thought of or portrayed in the form of a calf, by many analogous cases in other religions.⁹⁴ They extend from Assyria to the cult of Dionysos; ⁹⁵ even in the case of the Minotaur, the child of the bull sent by Poseidon, the calf-shape, not that of a bull, must in certain cases be assumed.⁹⁶ We shall see later that the heifer was closely connected, if no more, with an Italian deity, the Tursa Jovia of Iguvium.

Whilst the Vitellii and their goddess Vitellia ⁹⁷ have long since

been enrolled in our context,⁹⁸ there is a further observation which has so far escaped notice.

The family of the Mamilii from Tusculum falls from the time of its migration to Rome into two branches, the *Vituli* and the *Turrini*; they appear in our tradition from about the year 260 B.C.⁹⁹ The latter branch was called after the *turris Mamilia* in the Subura,¹⁰⁰ which was in the possession of the family and played a part in the worship of Mars. After the sacrifice of the October horse on October 15, which was made to the god, the two city quarters of Velia and Subura fought for the head; if the latter won, their team fastened the head after the fight to this very tower.¹⁰¹ A further relation of the Mamilii to the circle of Mars is seen in their descent from Telegonus, son of Odysseus and Circe.¹⁰² According to the genealogy, given at the end of the Theogony of Hesiod (1101 f.), Telegonus was the third child to spring from this union. The first was Agrios, the second no other than Faunus,¹⁰³ who has already met us in connexion with Mars. In the same circle the name of the *vituli* too must now be enrolled. It can be no accident, I think, that an Italus appears in Hyginus (*Fab.* 127) as son of this same Telegonus. The cognomen of the Mamilii, then, must be taken to mean, that a branch of the family called themselves 'young bulls', presumably after the bull-shaped Mars.

With this is established the connexion with those *Itali*, who gave Italy its name. The ideas from which we set out seem to be confirmed by the material at our disposal. One more peculiarity may also be brought into account. The use of the helmet with horns, traceable throughout Italy, is also at home in the south, with the Oscan-Samnite tribes.¹⁰⁴ On a painting on a grave at Capua¹⁰⁵ a rider is provided with such a helmet. On a fresco from Paestum,¹⁰⁶ too, a similar piece is found, and the finds in the Museum of Naples¹⁰⁷ furnish a material that tells its tale immediately to the eye; they are copies of mighty bulls'-horns, which are set on both sides of the helm. I should venture to assign this phenomenon to the circle that we have been discussing. The warriors thus adorned felt themselves as 'bulls' or 'young bulls'.¹⁰⁸ They fought under the sign of the bull-god Mars, they were, in fact, his immediate images.

2

With this last guess our discussion may be regarded as complete, so far as it is limited to our previous context, the cult of Mars. We omit such things as the appearance of the bull on the barn-money or on the ensigns of the Roman army and much else, where the direct reference to Mars must be considered uncertain.¹⁰⁹ They do not appear to yield any points of view or results of serious novelty. We must, however, emphasize one point, that the traces, though they certainly do occur, are yet relatively rare

at Rome. Wherever the relation of the bull to Mars appears, it is not so much the god's own bull shape as the corresponding sacrifice to him. After a great feat of arms P. Decius Mus sacrificed to the god *bovem eximium album* (Liv. 7, 87, 3; Plin., *n. h.* 22, 9); we may think too of the *suovetaurilia*.¹¹⁰ But even in this sphere the bull no longer reigns undisputed; already in the earliest Roman calendar there appears beside him the horse (*equus October*) as the animal allotted to the god.¹¹¹

The answer to the question, whether the bull-god ever appears on the monuments, is given in the first place by the Etruscan material. Among the frescoes of the Tomba dei tori at Tarquinii which are as early as the sixth century,¹¹² we find a frieze with remarkable pictures of an obscene character.¹¹³ This frieze runs at the back of the entrance-room above the doors, which lead into the back rooms. The groups in question, which are set just above the lintel, are sometimes accompanied by the representation of a bull with human face—that is to say, of a supernatural being, probably the bull-god.¹¹⁴

Little as we are able to make any authoritative assertions about the meaning of this representation as a whole,¹¹⁵ the appearance of the god in the art of the tomb is in itself of importance. For, in that art, the man-bull appears in a second group of monuments; on the bases of archaic urns from Chiusi we find repeatedly the same form, carved in low relief.¹¹⁶ The type, we must emphasize, was one that assuredly belonged to Greek archaic art and came from it to Etruria.¹¹⁷ On the older coins of the peoples of Southern Italy and Sicily the man-bull appears again and again, whether as the figure of the legend or as a river-god of local cult.¹¹⁸ The archaic reliefs in bronze of Ionian style, with the representation of the Minotaur, which have been found in Perugia, on Etruscan soil,¹¹⁹ that is to say, may be thought of in the same context.

Have we then stumbled on something borrowed, not from the native Italians, but from the Greek world? There is a further observation that seems to confirm this last view.

We know from Etruscan art those very common representations of the 'river-god' or 'Achelous'. They show the mask of an elderly, bearded man, with wet, dripping beard, and with the ears and horns of a bull. He appears constantly on gear and ornament of various kinds,¹²⁰ but above all on roof-terracottas of Etruscan or Etruscizing style. They extend from Veii, Falerii and Satricum to Campania,¹²¹ and thus cover the whole of middle Italy. This type of Achelous, too, like the man-bull before discussed, goes back to Greek models; ¹²² the result just suggested seems to be confirmed from another side.

But yet there are points that give us pause. First of all, the frequency of the appearance of Achelous in Etruscan art is, as far as I can see, something new to Greek art. Secondly, there is the important rôle, that the god in bull's form plays in sepulchral

art; this again seems to be an Etruscan peculiarity. The man-bull on the frescoes of Corneto or on the urns of Chiusi belongs here and the appearance of the mask of Achelous on sarcophagi, which is familiar to visitors to the museums,¹²³ points in the same direction, the more so, as there the god appears in direct connexion with the demons of the Etruscan underworld.¹²⁴

The question then arises whether the type of Achelous as a Greek form has not covered (and at the same time helped towards formal expression) another that was of native Etruscan character. We mean to suggest that Etruscans may have once had their own nether god in bull's shape, and perhaps may have represented him on monuments of sepulchral art, but may then have availed themselves of the already defined Greek type, in order to express with it their native conceptions. For the possibility of such a view further evidence can be adduced.

As a late example we may quote the Tomba dei bassirelievi in Caere. Amongst the luxuriant ornament of the reliefs appear the heads of two bulls. They are set on the interior of the entrance, above the door—at the same place as the man-bull in the Tomba dei tori. We might think at first of the rudiments of a frieze, something after the nature of a frieze of bucrania. But in Caere we have not skulls, but the heads of living animals. Against a merely ornamental function speaks the fact, that the same heads of bulls appear on the walls of Sardinian graves of the late stone age (Anghelu Ruju, Castelsardo: see below p. 76). Quite an ancient conception seems here to be preserved into late Etruscan times.¹²⁵

Further, the excavations on the Poggio Renza at Chiusi¹²⁶ have brought to light the base of an urn, in which, as usual the man-bull (or bull; the point cannot be decided) is carved. But this time it meets us in a special form: two reclining bulls are set back to back against a palmette.¹²⁷ We can show that this archaic piece has its counterparts, if not exact, yet at least related in motif, in an even earlier period. In these, the native conception is revealed in its original shape, without the disguise of Greek form.

We must mention first a grave 'stele', found in Bologna, that is to say, just beyond the northern border of Etruria.¹²⁸ It comes from a grave region of the late Villanova age (not far from the Palazzo Malvasia-Tortorelli) and shows in heraldic pose two bulls that extend themselves on both sides of a tree (a palm, it seems). Although not belonging to the cemeteries of the Etruscan Bologna, (Felsina) yet that stele, like the last phase of local Villanova art, as a whole (Arnoaldi), shows the working of Etruscan influences in art;¹²⁹ by way of it a type of representation from the ancient East¹³⁰ has come as far as North Italy. If proof were still needed, it would be given by a second piece, of the same age. It comes from the immediate neighbourhood of Bologna (Saletta near

Bentivoglio) and shows again, in similar pose, the motif of the two bulls rising on both sides of a tree. This time, however, the orientализing period of Etruscan art finds reflection not only in the posing, but also in the addition of a sphinx.¹³¹

We have succeeded in getting down to quite an old stratum, as early as the sixth century. What we have aimed at is the fact, that, on Etruscizing grave stelae of the Arnoaldi phase, the bull appears as a creature that stands in connexion with the grave and with the dead. That we should still be able to grasp this old and doubtless native Italian stratum is the more important, inasmuch as the adoption of the Greek form of representation is a very early one; it may be fixed at the end of the same sixth century. Very soon it became dominant; only in relics or beyond the boundary in the north has the original Etruscan conception succeeded in holding its own.



If we have now established that the bull possessed a chthonic significance in Etruria, we must not at once affirm that, as in the cult of Mars, he was the expression of a god. Not for the moment, that is to say; further reflection may lead us to such a view.

We have already guessed that Achelous and man-bull, a god expressed under animal forms, were linked up to older native ideas. The material, which we have submitted, has not disproved this, but rather confirmed it; not only could we demonstrate the bull on ancient Etruscan monuments, but there too its sepulchral meaning recurs. We are led, then, in order to explain the linking up to the Greek type, to recognize once again a deity, a veritable bull-god.

A further consideration points in the same direction. L. Malten¹³² is responsible for the important observation that in the case of sacrifices to gods whose original form was animal that animal was often offered, in which the god himself was thought to be recognized. The horse-shaped Poseidon receives horses, the bitch Hecate bitches; the same is the case with the sacrifice of the bull to Mars. We can now show that the gods of Hades likewise received the bull in sacrifice and therein may lurk the fact that they themselves were once conceived under this form.

It is the ancient Italian games and sacrifices of bulls, to which we refer. According to Festus p. 351 M. (cp. Paul. Fest. p. 350 M.) these games were given in Rome to the *di inferi*.¹³³ Their introduction occurred under the reign of a Tarquin—which, we do not hear—to avert a pestilence; it had attacked pregnant women and it was traced back to the sale of the flesh of beasts offered in sacrifice. In somewhat divergent form we hear in Servius, *Aen.* 2, 140, that those games were set up by Tarquinius Superbus,

quod omnis partus mulierum male cedebat. In historical times we know of such a festival in the year 188 B.C., when they were celebrated two days long *religionis causa* (Liv. 39, 22, 1); further, a fragment of an inscription has told us of *ludi Taurii* in Ostia (CIL 14 suppl. 4511).¹³⁴ Finally, the passage of Servius, already quoted, speaks further of *ludi taurei a Sabinis propter pestilentiam instituti*, which were celebrated, *ut lues publica in has hostias verteretur.*

The derivation of these games, which according to Varro was given in Festus, is lost as far as the decisive part is concerned. As there is no hint of it in the excerpt of Paulus Diaconus, we dare scarcely venture on such a completion as K. O. Müller tried in his edition. A second derivation¹³⁵ (in Servius, op. cit.) brings in the *hostia taurea* and interprets the adjective as meaning *sterilis* (Varro, *De r. r.* 2, 5, 6). We are reminded that in other places, too, sterile cows are offered to the gods of the nether world (cp. Vergil, *Aen.* 6, 251). To-day, we can scarcely question the derivation from *taurus*, 'bull', especially as the Roman *taurii ludi* are included in a circle of similar phenomena.

We must adduce here the sacrifice of a black bull and a black cow to Dis and Proserpina, such as is attested after the Greek rite for the first secular games of 249 B.C. (Val. Max. 2, 4, 5; Zosim. 2, 3, 3). Again in a Sibylline oracle in Phlegon, *mir.* 10 v. 37 f. appears the sacrifice of a black bull for Dis alone, where we have obviously to do with an imitation of those games.¹³⁶ That the *ludi taurii* of 188 B.C. go back to the *decemviri sacris faciundis*, has been assumed on the ground of the corrupt passage in Livy 39, 22, 1, but without good reason.¹³⁷ But it points in the same direction, that the first introduction of those games by Tarquinius Superbus was made *ex libris fatalibus*, which were presumably identical with the Sibylline books.¹³⁸ The inscription of Ostia, already quoted, allows us to guess, that the local *ludi taurii* fell at the end of May or the beginning of June.¹³⁹ We may remind ourselves that the secular festival of Augustus in its full extent covered precisely that time of year.

Let us pause for a moment and ask what result these facts yield for the question that we are raising. If it is correct, as we have suggested, that the *taurii ludi* were introduced into Rome on the ground of the Sibylline books, we should have to do with a Greek rite. Where its models and parallels lie must be asked later. But we can say without further ado that the appearance of a bull in games, devoted to the nether gods, reminds us forcibly of the results of our last section; there we met man-bull, bull and Achelous in corresponding shape in the realm of sepulchral worship. More, too, there as here, a Grecizing stratum could be distinguished from an earlier native Etruscan or Italian one. In contrast to the Roman bull-games with their probable Greek origin, stand the rites of the Sabines mentioned by Servius, in the case of which

no such origin can be observed. The way is at least open to us to think of a native set of games before the Greek version.

Leaving this possibility open for the present, we must direct our attention to another detail. In Varro, *de l. l.* 5, 154, we hear, in connexion with the bull-games, of horse-races *circum metas*. The festival, then, took place in the circus and, in agreement with this, Varro gives as site the Circus Flaminius in the field of Mars. Festus, if we may accept the completion of K. O. Müller (p. 351 M.), gave as a reason for the choice of place, that it was not right to evoke the nether powers within the *pomerium*. But yet another guess suggests itself. It cannot have been only a sacrifice; it must have been a ritual hunt and slaughter of the bulls inside the circus. If this were so, the Greek origin of the games, which we have postulated, would find its explanation. We find such ritual bull-hunts in Greece and Crete; in Crete, particularly, the monuments make it clear that the practice extends back into the great period of Minoan culture. To go further into the detail is unnecessary since L. Malten's new treatment of the subject.¹⁴⁰ We need, for the moment, merely note, that on Italian soil this form of ritual-hunt is attested by certain examples outside Rome too.

In the first place there is an Umbrian rite. On the tables of Iguvium (*Ib.* 40 f.; VII a 51 f.) there is twice described a practice showing a direct likeness to the Greek *βοηλασται*,¹⁴¹ as known in Cos. The animals were released, hunted and then sacrificed; but in this case it was not young bulls but heifers that were used, to correspond to the feminine deity, to whom the sacrifice was due.¹⁴² Further, the connexion between the process of hunting and goading (umbr. *tursituto* 'fuganto') and the name of that goddess, Tursa Jovia, is unmistakable. The Etruscan counterpart is supplied by a Bucchero jug from Chiusi, which dates from the sixth century.¹⁴³ The jug itself runs out into a plastic bull's-head and on the frieze that laps its side the ritual of the bull-hunt is plain; one after another the bulls hurry by, and, by the side of them, youths who try, as they run, to catch them by grasping at their horns and fore-legs.

It is just here that the analogy with the Cretan-Minoan pictures comes most forcibly into view.¹⁴⁴ It consists not merely in the hunt, but also in the fact that the hunt gives occasion for varied bodily activity—catching, running alongside, in the Cretan examples even leaping over their backs, taming and sacrificing. Even if we cannot say offhand what these practices in each case mean,¹⁴⁵ the mutual likeness is plain. This suggests that we should go back to the problem that we first set ourselves.

It has come out that the Italian bull-games most probably lead back to bull-hunts and ritual chases, such as are known in the Cretan-Minoan period and, as a heritage from it, in Greek cult. As it seems that these games in Rome were borrowed goods,

introduced towards the end of the period of the Kings on the ground of Greek oracles, there should perhaps be nothing remarkable for us in them. But, when we come to the bull-games of the Sabines, which are recorded beside the Roman and as established for a similar cause, immediate Greek influence could no longer be indicated. This view is now confirmed by the Umbrian and Etruscan cult. We find the same games recurring here in a context, which give no room to the hypothesis of Greek influence.

How are we to explain the entry of these games into the realm of native Italian cult? The question is raised again in a more acute form, if we neglect for a moment the special form of the ritual hunt and concentrate on the general question of the appearance of the bull and the bull-god in ancient Italy.

Everywhere, in Samnium, Umbria and Etruria, it has become clear, that a native form of the bull-god continued to exist in historical times, but that it went back to much earlier, even to prehistoric times. The results of L. Malten's extensive study now press for comparison.¹⁴⁶ He has succeeded in demonstrating the bull as the bearer of conceptions of divinity not only in Crete, but universally in the ancient East; in Egypt and in the whole of Asia Minor it appears in the most varied forms. The great age of these beliefs lies before the historical culture of Greece, even if in some of its later branches it extends down into it. Just as the horse, that was brought quite late to the 'middle' lands, particularly by the Indo-Germans, became an expression for important religious ideas within that very group, so had the bull, on the other hand, its importance for the pre-Indo-Germanic peoples.¹⁴⁷ The worship of the bull as a holy or divine animal goes back among them to a time, when the horse was not yet established in the realm of the Eastern Mediterranean.

We can no longer evade the question, how in our case we are to conceive the mutual relationship of the Italian and Aegean fields. The point to which we come is this: there must once have been a time, when, long before the historical civilizations of Greece and Rome, the bull-god was equally at home in East and West. In it the two halves of the Mediterranean world were bound together by an essential and important element in their world of religious thought.

This view may be helped beyond the status of a mere formal postulate by the religion of the ancient pre-Indo-Germanic cultures in Italy, hitherto so seriously neglected by research.¹⁴⁸

4

Let us first call in the evidence of the art of the ancient Italian rock-pictures. At the very first glance we are struck by the constant appearance of representations of a bull in every form. This was long since observed in the case of the Ligurian rock-drawings, on which the bull is actually the dominating animal.¹⁴⁹

One of the menhirs of Lagundo shows a similar picture, in scratched form, perhaps of a rather later date.¹⁵⁰ In the case of Val Camonica a similar meaning of the bull has been denied;¹⁵¹ but in this very field the most recent discoveries have added a rich material over and above the pictures of bulls that had been known before.¹⁵²

No evidence, it is true, is immediately given of the religious meaning of the bull. But let us direct our attention to a single picture.¹⁵³ On one of the numerous 'duel' groups the warriors are confronted with their shields and spears and on their heads or helmets they bear crests like horns. Some connexion with what we have already observed for the horned helmets in Oscan-Samnite context is at once assured.¹⁵⁴ The same phenomenon will soon be repeated for ancient Sardinia, where, as in Campania and Samnium, the worship of the bull as god was known.

Another district of occurrence opens out in Picenum. Of its pre-Indo-Germanic culture we have already spoken in connexion with the pillars of Novilara. Its importance is now revealed in another direction.

When the last wave of the Indo-Germanic Italians, the 'inhumating' people, trod the soil of middle Italy at the beginning of the first millennium before Christ,¹⁵⁵ the best stretches of country had long been occupied. Not only Toscana and Latium, but Picenum, too, was firmly held. Here and there, it is true, the new-comers succeeded in flooding or driving out the old population; on the grand scale it held its own. Between the region of Southern Etruria on the one hand and Picenum on the other, the inhumating peoples remained restricted to the mountains and could not reach the plains and the sea till a point farther south.¹⁵⁶

It must have been a warlike people that was then established on the Adriatic coast, from Pesaro and Novilara southwards.¹⁵⁷ We still know its weapons, especially its bronze helmets and war-chariots; we can well imagine how an army so equipped could make good its defence. What we know of its customs, institutions and religion is scanty enough. But one thing is certain; here too the bull-god was known.¹⁵⁸ He appears, indeed, in a special form, distinct from any that we have yet seen; in Picenum, it appears, we have a new, entirely independent province of the god.

Any one who has had the privilege of scanning the rich treasures of the National Museum of Ancona will know from its frequent appearance that type of bronze appendage or amulet, that shows animals of the most varied kinds.¹⁵⁹ A great number show the bull; he is generally treated on a scheme of wide diffusion, that appears, for example, in Sardinia, as a double forepart.¹⁶⁰ What it signifies must be left undetermined;¹⁶¹ but it certainly shows that we have to do with a creature of myth. And, further, a symbol, that is as characteristic as the bull of the Picentine finds,

is the axe; again it appears as an amulet for suspension, occasionally provided with cross, swastika or sun-disk.¹⁶² If both bull and axe individually remind us of the Aegcan (only that there the double-axe replaces the single), even more emphatic is the combination of the two. In Picenum, too, the axe is attached to the head or horns of the bull-amulet; ¹⁶³ the parallel to what is found in the circle of the ancient Aegean,¹⁶⁴ and even in far earlier times,¹⁶⁵ is complete.

We must note in passing that this symbolism can hardly be understood, except in reference to the sky and its signs, the sun and moon.¹⁶⁶ We find something similar later on the 'Gallic' helmets of Northern Italy, where, between the bull-horns already mentioned, appears the wheel-disk, the sign of the sun.¹⁶⁷ We find confirmation within the district of finds in Picenum, in a number of other articles, on which the rendering of solar ideas has been observed.¹⁶⁸ All this deserves special attention to-day, when it has been proved that even in Rome the worship of sun and moon goes back to the earliest stratum.¹⁶⁹

But this is not the point of main interest for us here. What does concern us is the assurance that, in the ancient Picentine culture, an old ¹⁷⁰ realm, localized on native Italian soil, of the bull and the bull-god has been revealed.

Further, let us turn our eyes to some inconspicuous monuments of the ancient Sardinians, which yet, as belonging to the sacred sphere, need to be mentioned. Among the minor objects moulded in bronze appears the bull, whether whole body or head alone; it is almost always a dedication, sometimes designed to be set in the Sardinian way at the top of a votive sword of the deity.¹⁷¹ Less important seems to be the occurrence of the bull on the handles of bronze vases,¹⁷² but of great importance are the fore-parts of bulls on the bows of those bronze boats and ships, which are found among the gifts in graves in Sardinia, and, as imports, on the mainland.¹⁷³ Here again there is reference to worship at the grave; we may at least say that we are reminded of the part played by the bull in Etruscan religion.

At this point there come before us uncalled those earliest evidences of Sardinian culture, that have been found in the graves of Anghelu Ruju (near Alghero in the north-west of the island). On the walls and pilasters appears the primitive relief of the bull, crowned by mighty horns.¹⁷⁴ The form is of the late stone age and recurs on the walls of a second grave between Castelsardo and Sedini.¹⁷⁵ The fact has a wide bearing—in both cases we have stumbled on a certain and very ancient connexion of the bull with the grave and the dead. It is not merely a general parallel with Etruria that is involved—the appearance of the plastic bull's-head on the wall of the grave-chamber, a definite and particular form, has already been noted in the Tomba dei bassirilievi in Caere.

The pieces of real importance remain to be described, those monumental bull's-heads of limestone or lava, which can only be interpreted as the remains of objects of cult. They come from the spring-shrines of S. Vittoria on the Giara di Serri¹⁷⁶ and of S. Anastasia in Sardara;¹⁷⁷ the very place of finding assures for the bull-god thus worshipped some kind of chthonic significance.¹⁷⁸ What is found here, then, fits in well with what we have observed on the mainland.

A late survival of these pieces of the Bronze Age is represented, as has already been noted, by the fine bull's-head of Orani; it is as late as the Punic or the Roman period.¹⁷⁹ But the relationship stretches even farther. Many common characteristics¹⁸⁰ have long since been noted, which link the culture of Sardinia to the prehistoric culture of the Balearic Isles, the world of the Nuraghes to that of the 'Talayots'.¹⁸¹ There, too, then, we meet the foreparts of bulls, marked by such adjuncts as the double-axe as the picture of a god. Once again, we may suppose, an ancient idea has found its expression, even if the actual pieces only belong to the Roman rule.¹⁸² How far the same is true of Spain, how far older native elements are hidden under the form there adopted of the Greek man-bull ('Bicha de Balazote')¹⁸³ cannot yet be finally answered.¹⁸⁴ At any rate, the finds in the Iberian stratum of Numantia have revealed not only bull's-heads and horns as amulets, but also the earthenware picture of a bull and its representation on vases. But, on them appear, too, dancing men, whose arms are stuck into bull's-horns, and who seem to imply some kind of worship of a being of this form.¹⁸⁵ Whatever view we may have to take of this, it is plain that this appearance of the bull-god in the great pre- and proto-historic culture of the Western Mediterranean cannot possibly be separated from what has been demonstrated for the East.

We have already discussed the manifold connexions that link prehistoric Sardinia to the world of the ancient Aegean. Just as in the round hut or, perhaps, in the false vault, a common style of building is revealed, embracing in early times both East and West of the Mediterranean area, so too in religion. Here too, it seems, we can point to a common 'style',¹⁸⁶ in the stock of ideas, and to the bull-god as a corresponding formal element.

We must pursue this line of thought farther. A. Taramelli¹⁸⁷ has called attention to a very remarkable offering, found in S. Maria di Tergu (Prov. Sassari). Two mighty bull's-horns, with ends thickened to look like balls, surround a middle portion, which renders in rough, summary forms a human face. The bull-god, for such we may now call him, is not necessarily, then, shown in his animal shape; the human form appears beside it or blended with it. On general grounds, as a blending of forms, this belongs to the same class as a certain small bronze figure, discussed above,¹⁸⁸ in which a number of limbs are united to form

a single body. In both cases, to put it in a purely negative way, the man and the human shape have not yet become the sole and distinctive form of the divine. Rather, the form strives to find expression in unnatural, extra- and superhuman shapes.

Perhaps the idea that lies at the root of this can be more clearly grasped. Just as the *εἶδος πολύγυιον* of the culture of ancient Sardinia is shared by it with the ancient Aegean circle, so too the combination of animal form with human. For our particular case, the bull or, as we should rather say, the man-bull, the essay of L. Malten gives evidence in plenty.¹⁸⁹ It is characteristic in general of the pre-Homeric age—and the same thing has been noted for the religion of the so-called primitive age¹⁹⁰—that animal and human expression of the divine do not exclude one another. For this world of ideas, a man, for example, can, beyond his own closest and characteristic nature, be also an animal or a plant. The same holds true of the god; again, the most diverse forms, that to our thinking cannot be reconciled, are possible side by side. To take one example, the river, conceived as a god, is not only 'this actual water that I can see flowing, hear murmuring or scoop up in my hand, but he is also a bull and, more than that, a being conceived in human form, just like a primitive group of men, who can at the same time be eagles or the like'.¹⁹¹

It is plain that the blending of animal and human shape that meets us in the religious picture expresses just that curious uncertainty, that flexibility in the conception of the divine.¹⁹² If we find similar forms, not only in the East, but also in Sardinia, of the bull-man beside the pure bull form, that implies the same way of expressing the divine. Beside the external agreement, that consists in the repeated appearance of the bull-god, we now meet an internal agreement, shown in a common way of conceiving the god.

After this line of connexion, linking ancient Sardinian culture to the East, we may draw yet one line more; it leads us back to the results that we gained from our consideration of the mainland cultures of Italy. The comparison of Sardinia with Etruria is at once inevitable; we have already been struck by the connexion, common to the two, of the bull with the grave and the under-world. The thread of connexion can also be drawn to the bull-shaped Mars of the Sabellians and Latins. There we met the peculiar feature, that a family or whole people not only named itself after the god, but also expressed its belonging to him in the form of its war-gear and weapons, in the placing of bulls'-horns on its helmets. The same feature recurs in Sardinia.

Among the small bronzes of Sardinia appear pictures of warriors, distinguished by this very form of ornament to the helmet.¹⁹³ Here, too, it consists of mighty bulls'-horns, comparable to the pictures which are met with in the grave of Anghelu Ruju or on the bronze of S. Maria di Tergu, which we have been discussing.

Nor does the likeness stop here ; just as in the cases mentioned (and in some others as well) the horns have at their tips thickenings of ball shape, so too have those other horns, which are worn by Sardinian warriors as ornament to their helmets.¹⁹⁴

There can be no doubt, that those warriors wished to rank as 'bulls'. This will mean not only that they felt themselves related to the animal world by a kinship that went beyond their human nature ; they must also have placed themselves in some relationship, however we conceive it, to the god, whom they revered in the form of a bull.¹⁹⁵ Only so can we understand why they should adopt for their own helmets that special form of horns that belonged to the bull-god.

5

An authority on ancient religions has recently drawn emphatic attention to the fact that our knowledge of the original beliefs of the Italians, as of the pre-Indo-Germanic peoples of the peninsula as a whole, is as good as nothing.¹⁹⁶ He thought it necessary to warn us against any guesses directed to that quarter.

Whether any one would venture of his own free-will into so unsure and thorny a region as that of the period that lies behind the history of Italy in the strict sense seems to me doubtful. But, in our case, we are actually compelled by that very history to push our inferences farther back ; it is in fact the very name of Italy from which the compulsion begins.

Let us look back on the way we have come. We began with an inquiry into etymology ; to support our results from another side we pursued the bull-god in his various appearances and in his not less diverse extension. Two facts have become plain. First, the peoples, which in later times were the bearers of the history of Italy, that is to say, the Indo-Germanic peoples and the Etruscans, still retained the bull-god ; but everything points to the time of his origin having preceded historical times. Secondly, it has been proved, that the pre-Indo-Germanic early civilizations in Picenum, Sardinia and the Balearic Isles, further the Italian rock-engravings, already knew the god and in this very point are in contact with the ancient world of the Aegean. A mighty kingdom of the bull-god extended throughout the realm of the 'middle' lands from ancient Asia Minor to

Spain. If we reflect on these facts, a conclusion will, I think, force itself on us. The Indo-Germanic peoples of Italy, which immigrated into the peninsula from north and north-east, from beyond the Alps and from the interior of the Balkans, in their immigration broke into that kingdom of the bull-god which we have outlined. They must, then, have adopted him from those civilizations of the ancient 'middle' lands, on which they impinged, and incorporated him as a part of their religious conceptions.¹⁹⁷

A comparison may make this clearer. It has been established that the peoples of the Mycenaean vault-graves were already Greeks.¹⁹⁸ Coming from the Balkans, they entered a zone of ancient Aegean culture and here, long before the historical culture of Greece, formed a culture of their own. In the process they took over the forms that they found, experiencing especially strong influences from Crete. The same seems to have been the case with the Indo-Germanic peoples of Italy after their entry into the zone of the ancient 'middle lands'.

But with this comparison we have not yet said everything or even the essential point. Whereas the Greek races in their further course set about fashioning a culture of their own, in contrast to the old 'middle land' forms that came to them and in a lively conflict with them, which must even be termed an overcoming of them, the Italians went a very different way.

The history of the bull-god himself yields proof of this. Not only did they readily adopt the god, so readily that they named themselves after him, but they also held fast to him with considerable tenacity. Even in their last fight with Rome, in the Social War the Samnites could still give the word 'Italia' as their slogan against Rome. They gave this name to their capital Corfinium and set the bull on their coins. In the very moment when their existence was at stake, they were able to recognize themselves still under the likeness of the bull and bull-god.

A second point must be added. Not only did the Italians surrender unreservedly to the culture of the ancient 'middle lands', after they had once penetrated into its realm, but even the adoption of Greek forms did not hinder them in

the process. They are only able to take over the man-bull of archaic Greek art so readily and give him an import that went far beyond anything Greek, because it permitted them to express the conception of the bull, that they had come to love, in a firmer and more telling form. Or, to put it in another way: they only employed Greek forms to give a sharper and more perfect expression to the older world that they had adopted. The Greek element for them meant no more than the vessel, into which they poured a content of very different origin.

Rome alone takes up a position of its own. It is really remarkable that the bull-god, in the state religion of Rome, at least, hardly meets us; we saw above that traces of the idea, but only traces have survived. Where the god appears, elsewhere, in ancient Rome, he is always introduced from without. The Mamiliii came from Tusculum and the *taurii ludæ* may be assigned to a Greek, or, if we stress the introduction by a Tarquin, to a Greek origin, by way of Etruria.

Herein is revealed a remarkable contrast between Rome and the rest of Italy. It is the more remarkable, inasmuch as we cannot mistake a common element which both experienced and at an earlier date adopted. But, whilst the Italians surrendered permanently to the nature of the ancient 'middle lands', the Romans later discarded in the course of their development what had come to them. For the moment, the tendency is purely negative; we shall see in the further course of our inquiry, that corresponding to it at times there is a positive and entirely original power of fresh creation.

(c) THE PICTURE OF WOMANHOOD

Whereas in Greece woman was subordinated to the rules and conceptions of a male society, in Italy she developed into forms of an entirely original character.

We have already come to realize the special part of the Etruscan woman. Beside Etruria it was Campania that created its own forms. In the case of the Etruscan woman it was the ambiguity of the purely physical, the contrast of bodily beauty and perishability, and with it all a dominant

note of the courtesan that seemed to be emphasized ; in the picture of the Campanian woman it is child-birth and fruitfulness that come out as the decisive traits.

The adoption of Greek forms in painting and sculpture, far from evoking on the Italian side that measured restraint, that noble discipline that is proper to the Greek representations of women, produced the exactly opposite effect. The Italian had now the artistic means in his hand, which enabled him to give actuality to that which he himself wished to express, that which he experienced as his most real experience ; the Greek form was used to help to give shape to contents of a quite alien nature.

I

Let us begin with the Etruscan woman. The pictures that the archaic grave-paintings of Tarquinii offer feel like a pictorial elaboration of her being, as we have been able to sketch it. A peculiar flowering of art and, we must add, a peculiar historical position coincided to make such a realization possible.

The Tomba Regolini-Galassi in Caere may give us an idea of what a grave of the conquerors and heroes in Etruria may have looked like. A great lord, a mighty warrior had in his life-time assembled these treasures by what we may imagine to have been a rich variety of methods. When he saw that his days were numbered, his lust of possession and his untamed will forbade him to let them go this side of death. They make him take all with him down into the grave, where he sits in state in the midst of his chariots and weapons, his costly gear and, at his side, his wife, laden with jewellery.

This epoch of snatching and conquering, of massive possessiveness is in Tarquinii already past and gone. Men give themselves up to the enjoyment of a fair and all too quickly passing existence. To grasp this existence, with its full-blown glory and glitter, with the germ of decay already at work in it—that is the task of the paintings of the graves. Consumption and enjoyment have taken the place of accumulation and retention ; the feast has replaced the expedition, the mock combat and sport have replaced the battle. There

are wine and garlands of flowers, beautiful boys and, most beautiful of all, the women.

But once more that ambiguity of their nature appears. The representation in picture cannot deny it.

On the back wall of the Tomba delle leonesse the painter, with bold touch, has placed a highly lively scene of dancing.¹⁹⁹ The centre is taken up by a massive crater, decked with ivy, for Dionysos is lord here. On both sides follow, first the musicians, then the dancers. On the left is one single woman, who moves in quiet, if expansive gestures. In long robe, tired with coif and pointed shoes, and over all the heavy cloak, cut in bell-shape, she offers a picture of solemnity and magnificence, of stiff archaic adornment. On the other side, in contrast, wantonness and lasciviousness reign. The dancing girl has thrown off all but a single light wrap and moves with passion and abandon to the music of the castagnettes. One of the drinkers has sprung to his feet, and, carried away, in ithyphallic excitement, he copies the movements of his partner.

Above the whole scene are two panthers; they fill up the pedimental space of the wall. These panthers too belong to Dionysos. But their nature has nothing in common with the joyous, emancipating, foaming activity that stands under the sign of wine. Behind them emerges the other side of the divine power, which means greedy destruction, madness and death.²⁰⁰ With their huge nipples and udders they are like the sphinx, which like them belongs to the realm of death.



Contrast with this Campania. As we pronounce the name of the land, we find ourselves in another world.

Country and human beings, both bear the same characteristic mark, fullness of life and health. Thrice or four times in the year does the land of Campania yield its increase, the ancients observed, and to-day as then its fertility seems inexhaustible. In harmony with this is the type of the inhabitants, as mirrored in the monuments, and above all in the type of the deities, whom the Campanians chose and formed in their own image.

Any one who has once gone deeply into the study of those

busts of gods, which adorned the outer ring of the theatre at Capua,²⁰¹ will bear unforgettably stamped on his mind a picture of their appearance. They are broad healthy faces, with sensual mouth and great fleshy nose. A low brow with pronounced eyebrows, a budding down on lip and cheek and, last of all, a massy chin complete the picture; it is energy and animal joy of life that are everywhere expressed.

There is something almost symbolic in finding these heads just in the amphitheatre of Capua, the greatest amphitheatre in Italy down to the building of the Colosseum. Just as that building, hiding all its horrors of blood and dissolute enjoyment, was surrounded on all sides by the blessed fields of Campania, with their wealth and gushing fertility, so too those gods resemble the human race, that found its supreme delight in the shows of the amphitheatre. It is the cruelty of health that here celebrates its triumphs.

Let us go back three centuries and the picture of the Campanian knights appears in the Oscan wall-paintings. We have a picture of a knight, of almost life-size; ²⁰² a horse of modest size, almost elegant in its build, the head small and mettled; it quivers under the weight of a mighty rider who seems to crush it with the mass of his thighs. The rider himself is the picture of animal force; under his linen cloak, the muscles of his breast are outlined; the impression of the full, red face is underlined by the fire-red plume and projecting feather. Flashing weapons and gear cover man and steed; the whole is a picture of true 'superbia Campana'.²⁰³

The Campanian woman too meets us on the wall-paintings. But her picture takes on more impressive forms, when she is raised to the realms of divinity. It is the shrine of the mother-goddess of Campania, of which we are thinking.²⁰⁴ Particularly we think of the votive figure, that has been found in many varieties, in which a seated woman is represented with one or more children on her arm.²⁰⁵

The goddess in question here was of Greek origin. The Oscan name of her priestess leads us to a name, which must have sounded something like **Damosia*.²⁰⁶ We think of Demeter with the same by-name ²⁰⁷ or of the Tarantine Damia, who later made her way to Rome.²⁰⁸ Correspond-

ingly, that type of votive figure proves to be of Greek origin. One of the oldest examples seems to render the style of the early first half of the fifth century.²⁰⁹ Greek type is also shown by the terracottas,²¹⁰ found in the shrine, and also by a later example of the figures themselves.²¹¹ The seated goddess there is rendered in counterpoise; to the advanced leg correspond on the other side child and encircling arm. But this kind is far rarer; it is quite other pictures that are dominant.

The face of that Greek type is itself of peculiar make. Gracious, indeed, it is with its wavy hair, its drooped eyelids and its neatly draped coif. But under this charm other traits announce themselves. The full mouth, with tight-closed lips expressing a sensual smile; this already hints at what is to find far more drastic expression later.

Once again a Greek form is only employed to give expression to a content of a quite un-Greek character.

The distinctive mark of most of the statues that have been found is this: a broad and regular seated posture, with feet set close together, the knees bent wide apart, like those of a woman in child-birth. The very folds of the drapery stress this open stretch. Further, one is no longer content with one child; several children on the arm are the rule, in one case we can count as many as ten. These children in their forms show no trace of humanity. A mere hint of them is enough, for it is the sheer number of children that is thought of. It is like the farmer who only cares for the plenty of his seed.

All else fits in with this ground conception—full breasts, plump, heavy arms, the whole rendered in massy, almost cubic forms. Everything here aims at no more than a demonstration of inexhaustible fertility, but within these limits the effect is very powerful.

We turn our eyes back on Etruria and see with astonishment that for the real nature of the Etruscan woman child-birth and rearing of offspring have no inward meaning. The children are the base of her position, if you will, of her power, but she herself is no mother in the proper sense of the word. To sacrifice herself, to lose herself in the life of another, that is something beyond her power. She is too much herself and this selfhood she retains even towards her child, as she re-

tained it towards her husband. An Etruscan can indeed name himself his mother's son and, as we have seen, this even becomes the rule in the later centuries. But no representation of the Etruscan woman, showing her as mother with sons and daughters, has yet been found.

Campania and Etruria seem at first to be opposites, regarded from the point of view of the position of woman, opposites, behind which the contrast of death and fullness of life, nearness to the lower world and animal concentration on this life is concealed. But, just as the powers of life and death, for all their contrast, yet condition one another and mysteriously unite, so do these two, apparently opposite types of women. This will become clear the moment that we bring into comparison the Illyrian peoples of Italy.



It has rightly been observed how large a number of Illyrian names give expression to phallic characteristics.²¹² We may instance: Titus, Titianus, or, with another formation of stem, Mutelius (*Mutilios*). A whole people, the *Τριβαλλοι*, thought fit to boast of their more than usual efficiency; in so doing they set themselves by the side of Priapus himself, who is apostrophized in the 'Carmen Priapeum' as *Triphallus*.²¹³

It has already been shown that this world of thought finds expression in art no less.²¹⁴ This brings us to a narrower field, that of ancient Istria.²¹⁵

The bloom of the Istrian civilization lies in the first half of the first millennium, before new tribes of immigrants, whose appearance is perhaps connected with the Celtic movement of the fourth century,²¹⁶ had forced their way in. The Istrian culture is called after the fortified settlements on the hill-plateaux (*castellieri*) the 'Castellier-culture'. Nesactium, which Livy knows as the royal seat of Epulus,²¹⁷ is the fortress, the conquest and destruction of which is for him identified with the subjection of the Istrian peninsula (41, 11, 1 f.) These 'castellieri' have yielded to excavation fragments of native sculpture. They were found in the pre-Roman cemetery of Nesazio, already then used for the laying out of graves. Originally they must have belonged

to a sanctuary, in which a pair of brothers, of the same sort as the Dioscouri, perhaps combined, as so often, with a female deity, was worshipped.

What concern us most are fragments of figures of youths, riding or standing. All are represented in ithyphallic posture. The pieces themselves belong to the sixth century and show clearly the influence of archaic Greek models.²¹⁸ The ithyphallic form, indeed, remains a local peculiarity, but it agrees with the fact that we meet on a monument the double phallus ; above all it agrees with the way in which Illyrian names are assigned.

We have already met the phallus as the representative of everything male, or, even, of the man in general, within the realm of Italy, in prehistoric Malta and again in Etruria. In one case beside it stood the type of the 'fat' woman, in the other, that of the courtesan. It is a proof of the inner connexion of these types with that which we have called the type of the motherly, child-bearing woman, that just here in Nesazio it appears beside the ithyphallic youths. It is everywhere nature, nature naked and unashamed, that determines these forms.

What I refer to is the torso of a naked woman,²¹⁹ who, either standing or kneeling, holds with her right hand a child to her breast and is, it appears, about to give birth to a second child, in which act she brings her left hand into play ; it is an unsightly, but very clear expression of a child-bearing and nurturing being.²²⁰

This representation again is unthinkable without a mastery of the plastic means, which Greek art put into the artist's hand. But, even if ithyphallic posture as such has correspondences enough in Greece, and even, if from the fact that creative and phallic demons are to be found above all on 'Dorian ground', older contacts between Dorians and Istrians have been inferred,²²¹ yet for this type of woman an analogy is much harder to find.

It is remarkable that only one single example can be quoted ; ²²² the very archaic mother-goddess from Sparta.²²³ She is attended by two youths, in whom the Dioscouri have been recognized. This connexion in itself fits in well with what we have seen in Nesazio. But it does not come into

question what is directly copied and most similar figures belong to quite another realm. The woman, who with one hand clutches at her womb, to give birth, finds her counterparts in the old culture of the 'middle lands'. Prominent examples are a rock-carving in North Africa (Fezzan) and a terracotta from Malta.²²⁴ Without entering into details we need only say that the form of representation, found in Nesazio, originally belongs to a much older world, the world, in fact, of the ancient 'middle lands'.

4

Finally we must take a look at Rome.

If the Italian woman was unconditionally fettered to the natural realms of death and life, fading and fruitfulness, to physical existence as a whole, it needs but a glance to recognize that with the Roman *matrona* things are very different. Those categories do not even bring us to the outer periphery of her being. It is not mere chance that even to-day we associate with the conception of the matron the ideas of dignity and reverence. Even where those realms of nature enter into play, they do so in incomparably more restrained forms.

To the Roman matron is attached from the first something that we may describe as moral character: greatness, importance and a general respect, which is particularly paid to her in public. On this her rank chiefly depends, never on a struggle for power, that should set her up as arbiter or ruler over man. Mother she certainly is; but, with that, she is not degraded to the mere biological function; it is not merely on the number of her children, but rather on their well-being, that her pride is built.

The Roman conception of woman found perhaps its strongest, most clearly defined expression, however, in the Vestal Virgin.

What the Vestal is, is shown plainly enough by her dress.²²⁵ She is the woman, at the moment when she sets about becoming that which she is intended to be. This moment is held fast, the moment of completion and consummation in the life of a woman, but it is retained as a moment that comes once and never recurs. In this too, and not only in the dignity

and self-restraint, which of course are not wanting in the Vestal, a Roman trait confronts us ; we shall meet it again more than once in the course of our inquiry.

Again a peculiarity of Rome in contrast to the rest of Italy has been established. With the repetition of this fact we enter on our discussion of Roman religion itself ; we are concerned with its relations to the religion of Italy as a whole, or, to put it more exactly, to that of Italy outside Rome. It will be among our tasks to reveal, where Rome comes into contact with it and where she differentiates herself from it.

Book II
ANCIENT ROME

Chapter I

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE CITY OF ROME

THE territory of ancient Latium is divided into three parts. In the east stands like a natural citadel the mass of the Alban hills; in front of them, Tusculum and Praeneste to the north-east, Lanuvium and Velitrae to the south, are thrust out, like fortified outworks. Next follows the plain on the coast, which descends from the mouth of the Tiber to the promontory of Circeii. Finally, on the north, the valleys of the Anio and the middle Tiber, which for its part forms the frontier towards Etruria, add themselves on. Here, a little below the junction of the two rivers, is the site of Rome. Its territory forms, on the right bank of the Tiber, a bridge-head opposite the neighbouring people to the north, just as the Etruscan Fidenae, at no great distance, formed a similar outpost against the Latin south.

A frontier position like this was bound to open up the city that arose on it to the most diverse influences. Etruria lay at the very doors and it needed but a little way down Tiber to reach the sea. With the interior, too, the river-valleys supplied a natural connexion. They led to the tribe of the Sabines, in its seats in the mountains round Cures and Tibur. As a matter of fact, the results of this position become manifest in the very earliest stage of the development of the city.

1. THE CREMATING PEOPLE

The ancient tradition marked the Palatine as the oldest core of the city and this view has not yet been shaken by any historical criticism. Rather have the archaeological investigations confirmed the tradition. Of importance for the earliest history of the Palatine are the excavations at

the *Scalae Caciae*, on the south-west side of the hill. They have yielded traces of mean huts, the settings of which in the overgrown tufa of the soil have left elliptical or rectangular depressions. The associated finds show that the settlement belonged to a date as early as the Villanova age, to about the tenth to ninth century. The Palatine city, then, was even earlier than the Romans themselves believed.

These results were destined to receive confirmation ere long through the discovery of a cemetery on the forum, going back into the same age.¹ The deep excavations of Boni began on a piece of ground, that lay between temples of the imperial age, that of Faustina and that of Romulus, son of Maxentius, and had chanced to escape later cultivation. Four to five metres below the level of the imperial forum there was revealed the skeleton of a cemetery, the lowest stratum of which contained fifteen cremation burials. That this enclosure once extended much farther is as good as certain. The cremation cemetery probably began just at the end of the Palatine city on the high back of the Velia, extended over the valley of the forum and climbed up the opposite slopes of Capitol and Quirinal. The grave-urns, of something like globular form (*doliola*), were here concealed in a hollowing which was covered by a great stone. Occasionally, graves of the type of the later *loculi* appear; a vertical shaft was driven into the ground and the urn, as well as the rest of the contents of the grave, was deposited in a hollow to the side, which was once again covered by a considerable stone slab.

What can we deduce from this earliest stratum of the cemetery for the religion of the Palatine city? Important, in the first place, are the numerous remains of food, above all the bones of young pigs and swine, which have been found in the funeral urns or in special dishes beside them. The rite, recorded in literature, has been rightly brought into account here, by which at a burial the sacrifice of a sow took place at the open grave. This sacrifice of the *porca praesentanea* was due to Ceres,² and we shall see later that she was the Earth-Mother. To the same context belong in all probability the remains of wheat and beans, which have been found on the remains of bones in the urn for ashes. The custom recurs elsewhere in similar form; through

Cicero (*de leg.*, 2, 68), we hear of an old Athenian custom, of strewing seed on the fresh grave.³ The earth meets us here in the extremes of her functions; she is, as everywhere in ancient belief, not only queen of the dead, guardian of that which has perished—she is at the same time the power, which makes the new shoots of life emerge from her bosom.

Significant are the traces which have been revealed of meals at the grave. We can still distinguish two kinds of meals. One of them corresponds to the later *silicernium*, the corpse-feast, which originally was served beside the pyre. There it was consumed, and the dead received his portion, which was deposited in the open grave. Beside this we can recognize such ritual meals as were taken after the closing of the grave—memorial ceremonies like the later *parentalia*.

The picture gains in completeness, when we bring into account the deep excavations, undertaken at another point of the forum. We have seen that the graveyard extended up to the slope of the Capitol, where numerous round and angular depressions (*pozzi*), cut into the tufa of the hill, seem to suggest cremation-graves. Here from ancient times was the altar of Vulcan; Romulus himself is said to have founded it. It is believed to have been rediscovered in a rough hewn rock in the neighbourhood of the later *umbilicus urbis Romae*. It is hardly an accident, that the god of fire had his seat inside a cremation cemetery. There is great probability in the suggestion that the oldest *ustrinum publicum* lay here and that that was why the god was established on the spot.

Even in later times the custom held that funeral processions should pass over the forum and that the *elogia* on the dead should be delivered there; in this we recognize the after-effects of the old cemetery.⁴ Varro connected this custom with the grave of Romulus, which was localized in the forum. With it we come to another place of cult, which belongs to the very earliest times.

According to the ancient evidence the place of the grave of Romulus in the forum was marked by a black stone. We hear too of two stone lions, which, after the Etruscan custom, kept watch at the grave,⁵ as also of an inscribed stele, on which, it was thought, the name of Faustus or Hostilius could be recognized. For this reason there was also talk of

its having been the grave of Romulus's foster-father or of the father of the third king, Hostus Hostilius, having been buried there ; the connexion with the founder of the city was, however, still not abandoned.

As is well-known, Boni has rediscovered this monument under the street pavement of the imperial forum, where its place was marked by a black marble cover. With it were found a number of monuments, the oldest of which is the very archaic inscribed stele, that belongs to the beginning of the Republic.⁶ Most of the room is taken up by what has been interpreted as an altar with grave-chamber ;⁷ in its form as now preserved it is no earlier than the late third century.⁸ The burnt débris of the attached trench for offerings, on the other hand, has yielded a series of objects, which in part go back to the seventh to sixth century.⁹ Even, then, if the monumental development is later, it is still possible enough, that the cenotaph, which was honoured as that of the founder of the city, enjoyed its cult in a very much earlier age.

2. THE INHUMATING PEOPLE. HARMONIZATION OF RITES ON THE SITE OF ROME

A change from what had been in existence before was brought about by action from outside. We can still see how in Latium inhumating tribes press in from the mountains of the interior at about the turn of the first millennium. The Volscians possess the plain and hills south of the Alban hills ; other Sabellian elements press forward into the plain between them and the Tiber. The influx of the Sabines is plain on Roman soil as elsewhere. The second stratum of the cemetery on the forum, which we have still to discuss, has placed before our eyes the burial customs of the immigrants and has taught us to understand the fact that on the line of hills to the east and north-east of the Palatine, the *Monti*, only graves of that kind appear. Soon after the cremating people had settled beyond the Tiber on the Palatine, the eastern hills were occupied by an inhumating race.

Let us begin at the Quirinal. Tradition assigns the settlement to the Sabines ; folk from the Sabine Reate are

said to have ousted from it the Ligurians and Siculi, the aboriginal population, that is to say.¹⁰ Further, an ancient settlement is plain on the Oppian; its points of departure were probably the *terreus murus Carinarum* (by the modern S. Pietro in Vincoli), but it soon spread over the whole level of the hill. The cemeteries of all these settlements lay in the east, at the place where still, in the time of Horace, men carried their dead, at the *Esquiliae*. Here originally the inhumation-grave alone was dominant, the *tomba a fossa*, as we have learned to describe it, in contrast to the *pozzi*. Remarkable is the fact, that we have found in one grave a complete warrior's armour, which cannot be separated from the finds in ancient Etruscan graves, such as the Tomba del duce of Vetulonia or the Tomba del guerriero of Tarquinii. The Esquiline cemetery, then, already shows in a grave of the eighth, or, at least, of the early seventh century, the influence of Etruscan culture.

What this implies we shall have soon to discuss. For the moment we must once again point out that our knowledge is completed by the cemetery on the forum. Above the oldest cremating stratum has been found an inhumating, the age of which is considerably later than the other; with its offshoots it comes down to the first decades of the sixth century. The corpses here are laid to rest either in the simple *fossa* form or protected by some few blocks and lids, placed there for the purpose, or else they lie in oak-coffins, which consist of a tree-trunk, split in two and hollowed out in the middle.

The grave-offerings, which permit of some inferences about the cult of the dead, are not much different from those of the cremating stratum: wheat and fruit-kernels, bones of cattle and sheep. It is of importance that in one case the bones of a small pig too were found lying at the feet of the dead. Here too, then, the *porca praesentanea* was sacrificed at the open grave, here too was Mother Earth worshipped.

From this it appears that the rituals of the two settlements on Roman soil had already come very close together. The fact is the more remarkable, inasmuch as cremation and inhumation ultimately imply very distinct conceptions of the dead. We have already considered the matter at an

earlier point in our discussion. If you bury your dead, that is to say, do not destroy the corpse before you commit it to the earth, for you the departed has by no means vanished from the world. He simply returns whence he came, to the bosom of the earth. So it is that in Athens the departed are called *δημήρσοι*, and in the same way the Samnites of Agnone, members of the inhumating race, speak of the *maabīs kerrīiīs*, the *Manes Cereales*; ¹¹ in both cases the connexion, the dwelling in earth, the mother, is involved in the name. ¹²

As companion of the earth-goddess the dead has become even more powerful and important than before. You must respect his activity and being, you must equip him too for his sojourn under the earth in the manner to which he was accustomed in life. That is why the corpse is carefully hidden in the grave, to ensure him a longer preservation, whether you lay him to rest between two protecting slabs of stone, or within a tree-trunk adapted to form a coffin. With the dead too are placed all his weapons and other gear, as he has need of them in his new life under the earth.

Quite distinct must have been the conceptions of those who delivered their dead to the destructive might of fire. The dead do not indeed cease to be, but they are gone from the world of the living. In accordance with this the grave-offerings of the cremators were originally very scanty; death has produced a fundamental difference of relationship to life and the present world. When the corporeal nature of the dead is destroyed they are sent from our realm into another world, which cannot at once be identified with the bosom of earth. That the cremating people originally thought quite differently of these things has been deduced with some probability from their oldest form of burial.

The cemeteries of cremating Italians, not only of the Terramare people, but later ones too—for example, those on the Fondo Arnoaldi at Bologna or the cemetery of the *Extraterramaricoli* in Pianello—show a remarkable picture. One urn of ashes lies close packed beside another; above the first row there is often a second and a third. We get the impression that those urns were not originally intended to be placed in the earth at all, but to stand ever open and

accessible. If this is so, we might make many guesses about the thoughts that accompanied this rite and the conceptions that were attached to the nature of the dead. In any case it must be obvious that the meaning of this deposition above ground must have been as different as could be from that of burial under the earth. A belief in Mother Earth, at once queen and custodian of all that has died within her, cannot have existed here; such a belief can only arise in an inhumating people.

Only through the consideration of a very ancient period can we hope to reach a clear picture that may serve, so to say, as a pattern. The aim of our argument up to now has, therefore, been to grasp the earliest conditions that are still recognizable. In later times all this is altered. The offerings in graves begin to be more numerous and more costly, the cemetery of the forum finally presents a much more advanced stage. Even the cremating inhabitants of the Palatine now make a sacrifice to Mother Earth at the grave; so too the wheat and beans that are laid with the dead show that the realm into which the dead has passed is not to be distinguished from that out of which the seed pushes its shoots and new life springs.

The ritual of the inhumating people, then, has encroached on the cremators. But such a form of influence is usually not one-sided. In point of actual fact the ritual of the cremators, in its turn, gained ground more and more and ousted inhumation. Only a few noble families clung even in later times to the ancient rite.¹² In one case we can still see that the consciousness of origin was decisive; the Claudii, whose cemetery lay at the foot of the Capitol, derived their origin from an Appius Claudius, who immigrated from the Sabines, an inhumating people.

Thus from the burial-rites we see that the settlements in Rome, though so different in origin, approximate to one another and develop in the direction of a single community. Another case reveals this course of development perhaps even more clearly. The inhumating stratum of the cemetery on the forum lies above the cremating. The inhabitants of the Palatine, then, gave place to the Sabine tribe, that settled on the opposite heights of the Oppian. That

can only have taken place after both communities had entered into closer relationships, determined by treaty.

We must assume, then, that the *συννοικισμός* of the different settlements proceeded from a close connexion between the Palatine and the southern of the two Sabine settlements; it was only subsequently that the settlement on the Quirinal came in. It is a pretty confirmation of this guess that the first stage of this *συννοικισμός* has left its traces in the Roman order of festivals.

What we have in mind is the festival of the Septimontium. It was celebrated on the eleventh of December and an offering was made to the seven *montes*. As such are cited the Palatium and Cermalus, the two points of the Palatine, then the Velia, lying immediately in front of its northern slope, Fagutal, Cispan and Oppian, the heights of the Esquiline, finally the Caelian in the South. With these seven hills is associated in our tradition an eighth name, that of the Subura. An attempt has been made to find it on the Caelian, but what is meant can be only the valley between the *Carinae* and the Fagutal. That explains how it could be added to our list. It lay within the Septimontium and had, therefore, to be mentioned, but as a valley it could not be classed with the *montes*.¹⁴

There was, of course no closed city-settlement, only a union of two communities with their suburbs for political and religious purposes; still less must we think of a defined city, marked by a wall.¹⁵ None of this is involved in the conception of a *συννοικισμός*.¹⁶

3. THE INTRUSION OF ETRUSCAN CIVILIZATION.

Let us sum up our results. The oldest strata of Rome have already led us to an important conclusion which we shall have to develop further in our ensuing chapters; we mean the close connexion of the development of the city of Rome with Italy as a whole. The growth of a unified settlement on the soil of Rome is only to be understood from the oldest history of settlement in Italy. A further gain in the same direction can now be registered. In quite early

times and from more than one side, a powerful wave of Etruscan influence flooded Latium.

In the inhumating Sabine cemetery on the Esquiline we have already encountered the grave of a nobleman or prince, the offerings in which reminded us of the graves of Tarquinii and Vetulonia. The completion of the tale we find in the valley of the Anio or on the slopes of the Sabine hills, just at the point where once the inhumating people broke into Latium. In Praeneste we have the two gorgeously equipped graves from the beginning of the seventh century, the Tomba Bernardini and the Tomba Barberini, and in Tibur too remains of similar tombs can be demonstrated. Here we already meet the culture of ancient Etruria in full bloom; Praeneste, at least, was then an important seat of rule and Wilamowitz's remark that it was probably once more important than Rome should hit the mark.¹⁷ We need not wonder, then, if we find in the Sabine settlements on the Roman *monti* some reflection of the ancient glory.

It is somewhat later that the traces of Etruscan culture appear within the Palatine community. The god Volcanus, who gives his name to the already mentioned Volcanal, bears an unmistakably Etruscan name, which cannot be separated from the Etruscan gentile names *vel̥xa*, *vel̥xai*, *vel̥xanei*, Etruscan-Latin *Volca*, *Volceius*, *Volcanius*.¹⁸ But the excavations on the cemetery of the forum too show how far Etruscan influence had advanced. In the graves of the later, inhumating stratum are found sporadically *Bucchero* wares, that is to say, Etruscan ceramic; the proto-Corinthian vases that are also found there will probably have come by way of Etruria. To Etruscan models point above all the two cisterns, that have been found in the excavations to which we have already more than once referred at the *scalae Caciae*. While the larger of the two is dated to the sixth century, the other is perhaps to be put back, on the ground of the sherds found in it, into the seventh.

Finally, let us scrutinize the names of the hills, included in the union of the Septimontium. Of these we may claim the Velia, Oppian, Subura (connected with Etruscan-Latin *Subernius*, *Subrius*, *Sobrius*, Etruscan *zupre*, *supri*), Caelian and Palatine with certainty as Etruscan—more than half,

that is to say. The name of the Caelian was later brought into direct connexion with that of Caele Vibenna, the Etruscan hero and companion of Mastarna. Their deeds have found an echo in the fresco of the Tomba François of Vulci and in the Roman history of the Kings, in which, in one tradition, Servius Tullius is actually identified with Mastarna.

The Etruscan names in the Septimontium are the less astonishing as we can set beside them a piece of evidence of approximately the same date. The oldest Latin inscription that we possess, the so-called fibula of Praeneste, already knows an Etruscan name. It states that this ornament was made for a certain *Numasios*, whose name is connected with the Etruscan gentile names, *Numisius* and *Numerius*. With this inscription on the fibula we reach the second half of the seventh century,¹⁹ about the date corresponding to the union of the two communities to form the Septimontium.

The names of the *Palatium* and the *mons Palatinus*, derived from it, deserve special emphasis. Both are inseparable from the Etruscan gentile name *Palatius*, which again is connected with *Palla*, *Palanius*, *Palas*. Beside them we have a goddess, the *Diva Palatua*; the sacrifice made to her on the day of the Septimontium was called *Palatuar*, her priest was named *flamen Palatualis*.²⁰ The name of this goddess and its derivatives were thus probably formed by means of a -u stem, a phenomenon that recurs in the formation of Italian names, particularly in the case of deities.²¹ Compare for instance the parallels:

(*Semo*) *Sancus* and : *Porta Sanguinalis* ;
Janus and : *Januarius*, *ianua* ;
Mantus and : *Mantua* ;

in Umbrian, too, similar phenomena appear.²²

In *Palatium*, *Palatinus*, *Palatua*, *Palanius*, &c., the stem is certainly to be designated Etruscan. A similar stem occurs, we may observe, in the pre-Greek sphere : *Φαλάκραι*, *Φάλασθος*, *Φάλλα*, *φαλέη* τὰ πετρῶδη, *Παλλήνη*.²³

In other cases too we find extensive linguistic connexions between Etruscan and pre-Greek languages; there has even been talk of a linguistic relationship of Etruscan not only with Asia Minor, but also with the pre-Greek world.

It is more natural, however, to look for a connexion in Etruscan itself. Perhaps we can argue back from the name *Palatium*. Beside *Trebatius*, *Trebanius*, Etruscan *trepania*, we have the forms *Trebius*, *Trebienus*, *Trebicinus*; all lead back to a divine name, the dative of which appears in Umbrian as *Trebe Jovie*, and which

must therefore be set down as **Trebos*. Correspondingly, we have not only *Palla*, *Palanius*, *Palauus*, *Palatinus*, but also *Palinius*, Etruscan *palnei*, *Palius*, *Pallia*, the root of which in Etruscan should be **pale*. In Latin the name should be **Palus* or *Pales* (cp. Latin *Aulus* and *Aules* beside Etruscan *avle*).²⁴

Pales is not unknown to us. The name appears among the deities of that oldest stratum of the Roman calendar of festivals which we shall have soon to discuss, incidentally also as an Etruscan deity. *Fales*, again, after which *Falerii* is said to be named (Paul. Fest. p. 91 M) should equal *Pales*; the change from smooth to spirant is usual in Etruscan. If, however, the oldest city, the Palatium and Palatine, was called after *Pales*,²⁵ we understand why the festival of that goddess, the *Palilia* or *Parilia*, the twenty-first of April, was also celebrated as the birthday of Rome. For this very festival the calendar of Antium (see below p. 105) has now yielded us a new (our earliest) evidence.

The name of the festival, it is true, in all our calendars is not *Parilia*, but *Palilia*. This has led scholars to suppose that, whatever the explanation may be, it cannot be derived from *Pales*. *Palilia* could by dissimilation only become **Paliria*, not *Parilia*, just as the suffixes *-alis*, *-clum*, *-blum*, *-blis* after stems in *l* become *-aris*, *-crum*, *-brum*, *-bris*.²⁶ On the other hand we should bear in mind that in the case of *n-n* the transition to *r-n* is quite old (*carmen* from **canmen*), that in later Latin at least in the case of *r-r* a dissimilation to *r-l* can take place as well as one to *l-r* (*peregrinus* > *pelegrinus*, *Καρόφορος* > *Calboforus* CIL 8, 10457). Moreover, we know an exactly corresponding change in *caeruleus*²⁷ from **caelhuleus* (from *caelum*) and *fragellum* from *flagellum*, from *flagrum*. Let us also reflect that, if not in the calendar, yet at least in Varro, *de l. l.* 6, 15, and Schol. Pers. 1, 72 (cp. also Tibull. 2, 5, 87; Ovid., *Met.* 14, 774; Pers., l. c. &c.) the form *Palilia* occurs and that the change, on the other hand, from *Parilia* would be without analogy, and we shall see that on the linguistic side no really decisive proof against the connexion of the festival with *Pales* can be brought. We think, then, that we have for the time being the right to hold to the traditional derivation.²⁸

Chapter II

THE EARLIEST CALENDAR OF FESTIVALS

1. THE TRADITION

THE Roman calendar of festivals can be recovered from a whole series of fragments of inscriptions. Mommsen, who made an attempt at complete restoration, collected all examples known at the time in the first volume of the *Corpus of Latin Inscriptions*. The versions that thus survive in fragments—to-day about thirty in number—date (with one exception that we have still to discuss) from a period from the foundation of the principate to about the time of Claudius. In that age, then, on the basis of the reform of the calendar by Caesar, these calendars on stone were set up in various parts of Italy, all unmistakably going back to the same edition.²⁹

In all cases two distinct classes of entries are at once marked out by a purely external difference. One set is given in capitals, the letters themselves filled in with black ink; they contain the original stock. To these are added other notices in smaller letters, often red. In contrast to the first class their later character is at once obvious from the fact that they give annotations of it; so also, from the fact that in expression and extent they are subject to variations is their later addition betrayed.

The whole range of entries includes very diverse parts. They may be classed in detail as follows: ³⁰

(a) The notices in capitals contain:

1. The letters of the *nundinae* A–H;
2. The special descriptions, so far as they are applied to the single days, in particular, those of the *kalendae*, *nonae*, *idus* and also the names of forty-five state festivals in all (*feriae publicae*);
3. The signs that mark the legal character of the day.

Above all we have the two great categories of *dies fasti* (F) and *nefasti* (N), according as it was *fas* to attend to civil business or *nefas*, as the day belonged to a god. Among the *dies fasti* are separated out the *comitiales* (C), which primarily marked the right of the magistrates to deal with the people (*ius agendi cum populo*). Beside them we have the *dies intercesi* (EN = **endotercaesi*), on which not the beginning and end, but only the middle of the day, was set free for profane business.³¹

(b) The notices in smaller letters contain very varied material, amongst it the comments on the newly added festivals of the age of Caesar and Augustus and on days of historical fame, the record of the games and the foundation-days of temples, or notes of religious and historical content, on the *feriae publicae*, set out in capitals.³²

That this division goes back to very early times has been confirmed by a find of recent years. In Antium, inside a heap of building rubbish, have been found numerous fragments of a fine stucco with traces of coloured lettering, which, when put together, yielded a list of consuls and censors and also a calendar of the known type.³³ There is one important difference; whilst the other examples all fall after the time of Caesar's reform of the calendar, we have here an example certainly belonging to the time before Caesar; to what decade it should be assigned has been matter of frequent discussion, but is of relatively minor importance. For certain, we find recorded in our calendar a thirteenth month, the *mensis intercalarius* or *Mercedonius*, the intercalary month of the pre-Julian year.

It is of high importance that the new calendar in its general set-out only differs in quite unessential details from the arrangement that we have described. The foundation, then, of the calendars of the age of Augustus to Claudius goes back into Republican times. But this does not exhaust the importance of the new find. We are not now thinking of the detailed notes, which, while yielding some actual gains, have also thrown up new problems. What we do mean is the confirmation of Mommsen's dating of the edition of the earliest calendar.

Mommsen began with the difference in the form of letters,

working on the principle that the notices in smaller script obviously represented additions to the part written in capitals. In them, then, lies the old stock of the calendar which was gradually enlarged. That this original stock must go back to a very early date Mommsen acutely recognized. A *terminus ante quem* was given by the fact that to the part written in capitals the cult of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and of the Capitoline Triad as a whole was still unknown. As the dedication of the temple in the year 509 is among the very few certain dates of early Roman religion, the earliest calendar must belong at least to the sixth century.

That this observation of Mommsen's is of cardinal importance is generally recognized ; we shall have later to consider it in detail. It might at first sight appear an impertinence to draw from a calendar of the Early Empire conclusions about the earliest epoch of Roman history. The Republican calendar of Antium now reassures us that here was a tradition preserved without a break. The part of the calendar written in capitals remained under the Empire the same as it had been under the Republic. We have here before us a codification of the earliest system of festivals, preserved in its original form, without change and without addition.

2. THE QUESTION OF THE *DI INDIGETES*

We shall not at once go into the inner arrangement and order of the cycle of festivals, but shall confine our attention to one special, if particularly important field—to that circle of gods, which we can deduce from the *feriae publicae*, which we have just mentioned in the earliest calendar. A short survey will be of value for the understanding of what must follow :

Carmentalia on 11 and 15 January	Carmenta
Cerealia on 19 April	Ceres
Consualia on 21 August and 15 December	Consus
Divalia on 21 December	Diva Angerona
Lupercalia on 15 February	Faunus
Fontinalia on 13 October	Fons or Fontus

Furrinalia on 25 July	Furrina
Agonium on 9 January	Janus
Idus; Vinalia on 23 April and 19 August; Meditrinalia on 11 October; Poplifugium on 5 July; Festival on 23 December	Jupiter
Larentalia on 23 December	Larcs, Larentina ²⁴
Lemuria on 9, 11 and 13 May	Lemures
Liberalia on 17 March	Liber (and Libera)
Equirria on 27 February and 14 March; Agonium Martiale on 17 March; Tubilustrium on 23 March; Equus October on 15 October; Armilustrium on 19 October	Mars
Matralia on 11 June	Mater Matuta
Neptunalia on 23 July	Neptunus
Opisconsivia on 25 August; Opalia on 19 December	Ops or Ops Consiva
Parilia on 21 April	Pales
Portunalia on 17 August	Portunus
Quirinalia on 17 February	Quirinus
Robigalia on 25 April	Robigus
Saturnalia on 17 December	Saturnus
Agonium on 11 December	Sol Indiges ²⁵
Fordicidia on 15 April	Tellus
Terminalia on 23 February	Terminus
Agonium on 21 May	Veiovis
Vestalia on 9 June	Vesta
Tubilustrium on 23 May; ²⁶ Volcanalia on 23 August	Volcanus
Volturnalia on 27 August	Volturnus

In interpreting this series of deities Wissowa set out from the conception of the *di indigetes*. He puts them in opposition to the *di novensides* or *novensiles* and supposes that the two represent mutually exclusive groups of deities. On the one side would stand the native gods, the *indigetes*, whose name is to be translated as *indigenae*, *ἐνδογενεῖς*; on the other, the *novensides* (from *novus* and **inses*, immigrants, *νεοπολίται*), a kind of new citizens who were added

from outside to the native gods. Wissowa carries the analogy with the sphere of politics still further when he says that even within the circle of the gods one could speak of patricians and plebs. 'Both classes', thus he formulates his view,³⁷ '... stand in the full possession of religious citizenship, but on a distinct legal basis and with strict separation of the two groups; not only is membership of both at once excluded, but also the transition from one to the other; the circle of the *di indigetes* from a definite point in time ranks as closed; all the numerous adoptions of new cults only swell the class of *di novensides*.'

Wissowa goes on to ask how the circle of the *di indigetes* is to be determined. As the most important sources for its reconstruction he thinks that he can recognize the following:

(1) The order of the priesthoods in Rome. Apart from the college of the *IIviri sacris faciundis*, which we shall have to discuss later, all the priestly colleges (the *pontifices* with the *rex sacrorum*, the *flamines*, *augures*, *fetiales*, &c.) belong to the earliest period, which goes back beyond our historical tradition. We may, therefore, thinks Wissowa, unhesitatingly reckon all the deities that they honoured to the circle of the *di indigetes*;

(2) The deities of our calendar;

(3) The deities of such festivals as should belong to the earliest period, even though not present in our calendar. Among these we must reckon the movable festivals (*feriae conceptivae*) or such as are not celebrated by the community as a whole, but in separate categories, *pro montibus*, *pagis*, *curiis*, *sacellis*; finally, such festivals as are not recorded in the calendar because they merged with others.

On the ground of the sources mentioned under (1) and (3). Wissowa thinks that he can increase the circle of the *indigetes*, named in the earliest calendar, by a few more names, for example:

Carna—festival on 1 June;

Falacer—*flamen Falacer*;

Flora *flamen Floralis*, *Florifertum* (belonging to the *feriae conceptivae*);

Lares—*Compitalia*;

Pomona—*flamen Pomonalis*.

That Anna Perenna does not belong in this context has been shown elsewhere.³⁸ But Juno is still to be mentioned; for it is very probable that the *Nonae Caprotinae* on 7 July belong to the oldest order of festivals and only escaped special note in the calendar, because the day of the *nonae* was already sacred as such; Juno is also mistress of the Kalends of each month and as such is

designated as Juno Calendaris ³⁰ at Laurentum. In any case her membership of the oldest order of deities is assured by the fact that the sixth month of the year, the *mensis Junius*, is named after her. We shall go later into the linguistic problems presented by the name of this month.

All this implies but a slight overstepping of the circle, as we first circumscribed it. We may say that the class of *di indigetes*, on Wissowa's view, is primarily to be sought among the deities of the earliest order of festivals.

The view, which we have tried to characterize in brief, has till recently been accepted without question; it may still be said to hold the field to-day. That is the more reason why it is appropriate to test its foundations afresh. The plan of this book requires us to confine the necessary polemic to a minimum. We cannot undertake here to investigate the conception of the *di indigetes* on the ground of the whole tradition. We must confine ourselves to the negative argument and to proving that what Wissowa thought he could recognize in that conception is not really demonstrated either by the evidences which he adduces or by the nature of his argument.

Wissowa, in his attempt at interpretation, deliberately refuses to rely on the poets or on the glosses that have come down to us. He can, he thinks, the better dispense with them, inasmuch as they only begin with the age of Augustus and, by that time, the meaning of *di indigetes* and *novensiles* was no longer familiar. He will not even draw into the range of his discussion the deity, who bears the name *Indiges* as special designation, Sol.⁴⁰ Decisive for him are etymology and the sacred formulae.

Let us begin with the latter. At the *devotio*, described by Livy (8, 9, 6), the person making it names one after another Janus, Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus, Bellona, the Lares, then the *divi novensiles* and *di indigetes*, finally the gods, *quorum est potestas nostrorum hostiumque*; at the very end, in accordance with the meaning of the act, by which the man making the *devotio* dedicates himself and the army of the enemy to the powers of the Underworld, stand the Manes.

What can we deduce from this formula? ⁴¹ It strikes us at once that the *di indigetes* are named by the side of such

deities as are, in Wissowa's view, already included in the general designation. Jupiter, Janus, Mars, Quirinus and the rest all belong to the *indigetes*, and we cannot see why they should also be quoted separately. Wissowa tries to evade this difficulty by assuming that, with the mention of the *divi novensiles* and the *di indigetes*, a *generalis invocatio* is given. Such a general appeal to all gods was prescribed by Roman custom after the mention of certain special deities, who came particularly into question for the case in hand. It was given in various forms, either by the words *di deaeque omnes, ceteri di ceteraeque deae*, or by summing up mutually exclusive groups; *di omnes caelestes vosque terrestres vosque inferni*.⁴¹

Such a *generalis invocatio* we might in itself expect in this case. But for this purpose the mention of the gods who have power over friend and foe would in itself suffice. Here we have a description of the same type as those just given; a further list seems unnecessary. We have not yet, then, the proof that in *divi novensiles* and the *di indigetes* a *generalis invocatio* is really present. There would be nothing to prevent us from seeing in them a group of gods assembled together on some principle or other, like the Lares named before them or the Manes who appear at the end.

But the evidence of our document makes it altogether doubtful whether these two groups really had the mutually exclusive meaning which Wissowa attributes to them and which is the only reason that would permit the two of them to describe the sum total of the state-gods of Rome.

Suppose for a moment that it is really a case of old native and new-comer gods; it would be quite inconceivable, then, how they came in this case to name the *novensiles* before the *indigetes*. It is the *indigetes* who must stand in the first place; the later adopted deities can only be named after them. Further, it is surely highly remarkable that in no other passage are the two groups named together, as we might expect, if it really is a case of sacral conceptions which are related to one another and which only receive their full meaning in that relationship. Jupiter, for example, appears with the *di indigetes* on an inscription (CIL. 10, 5779), without any mention being made of the *novensiles*. In

Praeneste, again, there were *indigetes* (Servius, *Aen.* 8, 678), but again not their converse. On the other hand, two inscriptions—a Marsian ⁴³ and one from Pisaurum (CIL. 12, 375)—give the *novensiles* alone; the same is true of the Etruscan sky-temple in Martian Cap. 1, 46.

Wissowa indeed thinks that he can recognize the pair of *indigetes* and *novensiles* in the formula of the oath in Diodorus 37, 11 D. (17 B.).^{43A} To the former correspond the *κτίσται γεγεννημένοι τῆς Ῥώμης ἡμίθεοι*, to the latter the *συναυξήσαντες τὴν ἡγεμονίαν αὐτῆς ἡρώες*. Wissowa himself felt bound to confess that it was only a case of a rendering gone 'awry'. Actually neither phrase, *ἡμίθεοι* or 'founders of Rome', supports the view that there is any question of gods at all; the further question, whether there is identity with the *indigetes*, may reasonably, then, be shelved. The same holds for the second group, where, apart from all other objections, the very description as *ἡρώες* renders identification with the *di novensiles* impossible.

We may add one further difficulty. Before the two groups that we have named a series of other deities were invoked in the oath-formula; the Capitoline Jupiter, Vesta, Mars, Sun, (*τὸν γενάρχην Ἥλιον*) and Earth.⁴⁴ One might suppose then, that in our case again a *generalis invocatio* appears. Against this, however, is the fact that there is no question of gods at all, but only of *ἡμίθεοι* and *ἡρώες*. The decisive point is this—that on pure grounds of grammar the two groups in question can hardly be regarded as a conclusion and summing-up; they are set beside the deities before mentioned as new elements (*ἔτι δέ*) of the same order of importance.

I pass deliberately over several other objections that may be raised against Wissowa's interpretation, because they would demand a long excursus. We turn to the third passage adduced by Wissowa, although there too there is no mention of *indigetes* and *novensiles*. Tertullian, *adv. nat.* 2, 9 speaks of *di proprii* and *communes, publici* and *adventicii*. In the two last groups Wissowa thinks that he can again recognize his two classes; Tertullian, to avoid old terms that had ceased to be intelligible, has introduced new descriptions. But, even if we grant that the conception of *di adventicii*

coincides with that of *novensiles*, yet the *di publici* are surely something quite distinct from the old native deities. This is not affected by the fact that their altar was placed on the Palatine, that is to say, the oldest part of the city. Rather does the fact prove that the description, *di publici*, was no innovation of Tertullian, displacing the technical term, *di indigetes*, that had become meaningless, but that these gods were actually so named in cult. That cult should have replaced the traditional name by a new one is not only unproved, but quite incredible on general principles.

We have still to add a word on the etymology. In the inscription of Pisaurum, quoted above, the name *novensides* is written in two parts: *nove. sede*. This manner of separation is not at all in favour of the explanation as *novus* and **inses*, quite apart from the fact that the second word represents a mere guess and is not attested in the Latin vocabulary. Even the Greek counterpart, the term *νεοπολῖται*, does not necessarily denote the 'new citizens'. The most obvious explanation is that it denotes the inhabitants of a new city; the opposite is *Παλαιοπολῖται*, citizens or inhabitants of the 'old city' (*Παλαιόπολις*), not 'old citizens'.⁴⁵

Even worse are the prospects of the interpretation in the other case. Wissowa originally equated *indiges* with *indigena*, but rightly abandoned this view because of linguistic difficulties in the way. The interpretation that he next accepted, that of v. Grienberger,⁴⁶ as **end(o)-agit-es*, the 'indwellers', is linguistically unobjectionable, but still far from satisfying. On purely internal grounds Wissowa's former explanation had the advantage of actually expressing what Wissowa believed he found in the conception of *indigetes*. 'Inborn' gods could only mean old native gods. In the case of the 'indwelling' gods it is not clearly stated wherein they dwell. One might think of the boundaries of the homeland, but one might equally well think of those who dwell under the earth. Further, there is no indication of the time since which the *indigetes* dwell in Rome. The newly received cults, too, dwell there, only not from the beginning; but this fact should find expression in the name of the *indigetes*, if it was really distinctive for their character.

The decisive objection is that the meaning of 'dwell' for

agere cannot be attested for the early period.⁴⁷ If v. Greinberger quotes Tacitus, *Hist.* 4, 12, 6 *Batavi donec trans Rhenum agebant*, that proves nothing for our case. With this all other kindred combinations fall to the ground, for example the connexion with the *Ancites* of the Vestini or with the goddess *Angitia* (mars. *Actia*, pelignian *Anaceta Anceta Anacta*, oscan *Anagtiai*, dative singular). Further, we have not the slightest objective reason for supposing that these goddesses had the same meaning or even a kindred meaning to the *indigetes*. If we weigh further the very remarkable change from smooth to media (*c* and *g*), characteristic of the rewriting of Etruscan words in Italian dialects, as also the fact that the connexion of the second vowel with the stem is by no means proved for *Anaceta*, *Anacta*, *Anagtai*, we shall prefer to come to the conclusion that we are dealing with an Etruscan gentile name. We have the prenomen *Ancus* and its derivatives, *Ancilius*, *Ancitus*, *Ancitius* and the river *Angitula*,⁴⁸ which at least suggest such an interpretation. The goddess *Angitia* and perhaps the *Ancites*, too, would in that case belong to the class of gentile gods that we shall have to discuss.⁴⁹

Another remarkable interpretation has recently been suggested by E. Schwyzer,⁵⁰ who related the name of the goddess to a root **an-ag-* (Latin *aio*, *adagio*, *prodigium*, Greek *ἄνογα*) and interpreted it as 'utterance', voice of the goddess (**Oosa*; cp. the Roman *Aius Locutius*).⁵¹ But even this does not supply any connexion with *indigetes* or *indiges*, for their meaning, according to the express testimony of Diodorus (37, 11D.; 17B.) and Johannes Lydus (*de mens.* 4, 155; p. 172, 20W.) was none other than *γερύετης*.⁵²

Under these circumstances we must, for the time being, deny ourselves a really satisfactory explanation of *indiges*. With this, the last support for Wissowa's thesis falls to the ground. A fresh inquiry into the nature of the *indigetes* must begin with the complete ancient tradition (not with an artificial extraction from it like that of Wissowa), and from definite deities who bear the name, such as Sol Indiges of the Quirinal or Jupiter Indiges of Lavinium. Such an inquiry, as we have said, goes beyond our limits. We are content here to establish the fact that in no case can the

indigetes mean what Wissowa thought they meant. There can be no question of the Romans having separated out a definite class of old native gods from their cult as a special group. A separation, no doubt, exists; the festivals, and with them the gods of the oldest calendar form a closed circle, into which nothing new could again be accepted. We may surely also expect here, if anywhere, within this circle to find the oldest national gods of Rome or Latium. But that such gods and no others stood in the earliest calendar, that that calendar represents an order restricted on national lines—that we hold to be an unprovable hypothesis.

After this the way is free for a new appraisal of the earliest order of cult.

3. ETRUSCAN DEITIES

Let us at first work on purely linguistic lines. Ceres, Consus, Faunus, Flora, Fons, Janus, the Lares, Larentina, the Lemures, Liber, Mater Matuta, Neptunus, Ops, Portunus, Robigus, Sol, Terminus, Veiovis, and Vesta bear names that can be derived with certainty from Latin. Beside them, however, we find a second stratum, for which such a derivation is not merely doubtful, but quite out of the question.

We have already spoken of Vulcanus and how he belongs to a series of Etruscan gentile names. According to our present state of knowledge, the name can only denote the god, who belongs to the family *velxa* = *Volca*. We have at once the remarkable fact that a god is called after a family; we must assume that he was specially worshipped by it, perhaps that he was regarded as its divine ancestor. Further, we must emphasize the fact that the family and, as a result, the god too, by their names point to Etruscan origin.

Vulcanus is not alone in this peculiarity. Saturn, too, can surely be nothing but the god of the Etruscan family *satre* or *Satria*,⁵³ Voltornus only the god of the family *velthur* or *Volturia*.⁵⁴ In the same direction, too, must an explanation be sought for the name of the Diva Angerona.

Mommsen saw in her a goddess of the early light, named after the 'upbringing' of the sun (**an-gerere*). In this there

are substantial difficulties. To the festival of the goddess, the *Divalia* of 21 December, was later added a sacrifice to *Ceres* and her companion, *Hercules*. We might therefore conjecture that the two goddesses were related in some way or other. This, at least, is plain, that *Angerona* was no goddess of light, but rather a chthonic goddess. The only real evidence in our hands for determining who she was consists in a notice about her statue. She was represented in the *curia Acculeia*, placing her finger on her closed mouth. In the past this notice has simply been discarded: ⁵⁵ the statue, it was said, was certainly a Greek one, and the transference of a foreign type of portraiture to our goddess may well have depended on the most capricious grounds. Meanwhile, finds have taught us much which should dispose us to a more cautious judgement; the importance of Etruscan art has become plain in *Veii*, *Satricum*, *Falerii*, *Velitrae*, as also its wide independence in face of its Greek models. But, even if we leave all this out of account, a Greek type could only be adopted if it actually stood in relationship to the nature of the Italian goddess. In our case, the gesture of silence is intelligible enough; it assigns the *Diva Angerona* to the *silentes*, the *taciti manes*, that is to say, to the dead.⁵⁶

We now come to the name.⁵⁷ A verb **an-gerere* does not exist in Latin, and, what is more serious, the preposition and the suffix *-ōna* are both unexplained on this line of approach. It is far more natural to think of an Etruscan family name: *Anc(h)arius Ancharenus Ancharienus* and, with them, the *dea Ancharia*, named after the family. *Ancharius* in Etruscan has the form *anxari*, but we also find *ancarini* ⁵⁸ *ancra*, and, again *Ancuria Anqurinnius Anquirienius*, which show that the vowel of the second syllable was subject to variation. If we compare the relation of Etruscan *tarxi* to *tarxu*, *veluri* to *velhuru*, *veli* to *velu*, the form *anxaru*, **ancaru* (cp. *ancarual*) or **ancru* is what we should expect. From this form **ancru* (by means of the change from smooth to media already noted above in the transliteration of Etruscan words) would be derived *Angerona* (cp. *Λατώ* and *Latona*).

In other words, we meet as early as the earliest calendar the gentile gods, as we have become accustomed to call

them; ⁶⁰ that is to say, gods who were at first worshipped solely by particular families, and only found their way from them into the state-cult. What such a gentile cult means and how the transition to state-cult took place we shall have later to discuss. For the moment, we are only concerned to establish the fact that within the earliest circle of gods there was a stratum of such *numina*, who got their names from Etruscan families and obviously came with them to Rome.

Another goddess who undoubtedly points to Etruria is Furrina. Her festival, the Furrinalia, was celebrated on 25 July; her shrine lay on the southern slope of the Janiculum, not far from the Tiber. In later times, as excavations have revealed, it underwent manifold Eastern influences. Certainly Furrina, the real owner of the cult, early sank into the background; Varro, at least, attested for his own age that even the name of the once famous goddess remained known only to a few (*de l. l.* 6, 19). Despite this, it seems that we can still in some measure define her nature. We must go more closely into this question, as it is only from this point that we can solve the question of her origin.

To begin with, a plurality of goddesses is mentioned within her holy grove (*Forinae* CIL. 6, 422).⁶⁰ What is more, a dedication has been found; *νυμφες Φορρινας* (= *νύμφαις Φορριναῖς*), where again we meet a plurality and also the description as nymphs.⁶¹ These two facts agree, in so far as the nymphs too are regularly found as a group. When Cicero (*ad Quint. frat.* 3, 1, 4) mentions in the district of Arpinum a *ponticulus, qui est ad Furrinam*, he seems to imply that the shrine of the goddess was in the neighbourhood of a water-course; this again might mean that we have to do with a nymph.

Wilamowitz ⁶² has already expressed himself to similar effect. He thought that with Furrina and her kindred goddesses we have to do with 'the natural forces of the earth, conceived sometimes as mother, sometimes as a group of young women'. This interpretation gains considerable weight from the fact that we are directed from another side towards a relationship with the earth, and, in particular, with the underworld.

In Plutarch's story of the flight of Gaius Gracchus there appears by the wooden bridge over the Tiber a *λεγὸν ὄμιλος Ἑρινῶν* (*Gracch.* 17), which recurs in the same context in Aurelius Victor as *lucus Furrinae* (*de vir. ill.* 6). Furrina, then, or, rather, the plurality of Furrinae, was identified with the Erinyes. This should not surprise us in its relationship to the underworld; on the contrary, the two facts mutually supplement one another.

This identification has hitherto been regarded as unimportant for her original meaning. It was, we are told, only caused by the

accidental similarity of name to the *Furiae*, who are 'no more than a translation of *μαῦραι*, a name of the Erinyes, in which their meaning in late belief seemed to be expressed'.^{82a} But, if we look closer at the decisive passage in Cicero, *de nat. deor.* 3, 46, it says something quite different from what people have wanted to read out of it. It reads: *si haec (Hecate) dea est, cur non Eumenides? Quae si deae sunt, quarum et Athenis fanum est et apud nos, ut ego interpretor, lucus Furrinae, Furiae deae sunt, speculatrices, credo, et vindices facinorum et sceleris.* The sequence of thought is this, that from the divine nature of Hecate that of the Eumenides at once follows and that they, who for their part are identical with Furrina, again supply the proof that the *Furiae* represent goddesses. It is simply not the fact that only the similarity of name between *Furiae* and Furrina leads to the inference that the former like the latter are identical with the Eumenides. The identity of Eumenides and Furrina is firmly established before the *Furiae* are even named.

But how did men come to identify Furrina with the Erinyes or Eumenides?

It has long been recognized that these goddesses represent a model of the earth herself. From their hands comes the blessing of the earth, their nearest relatives are goddesses like the Charites. At the same time they denote the guardians of the eternal ordinances, which are bound to the earth and to the course of nature in general. But the same goddesses are also the inexorable persecutors of those who have offended against this order. With their mild and kindly character, which is expressed in the description as Eumenides, as *Σεμεναι, Πόρνιαι*, is contrasted their nature as hellish spirits of the curse and goddesses of revenge. In this they are like Mother Earth herself, who is at once giver and taker, benevolent and irate,⁸³ giver of all that lives and grows, but also queen of the dead.

From this point of view we arrive at a fresh agreement with Furrina. She has been revealed as nymph, that is to say, as the incarnation of the natural forces of the earth, and, on the other hand, as goddess of the underworld and, at the same time, guardian of the natural order and of right. When Gaius Gracchus found his end in this very grove of Furrina, we can, I think, palpably grasp the connexion with the avenging and punishing spirits of Hades.

Now that we have found in the nature of Furrina Mother Earth in the opposing aspects of giver of life and queen of the underworld, it will, I hope, be possible to find out something about her origin.

In Martianus Capella 2, 164 appear a series of goddesses, who undoubtedly belong to Hades; Mana and Mantuona, the gods *quos Aquilos dicunt*, Mater Mania. The goddess Mana can no more be separated from the souls of the dead, the *di manes* and Mania,

who, as mother of the Lares belongs to the same sphere,⁶⁴ than can Mantuona from the Etruscan god of death, Mantus, and Manturna, who certainly belongs to the same context.⁶⁵ The 'dark' gods appropriately attach themselves as a company to this sphere; we know them from the Etruscan grave-paintings, on which the leader of the dead, *Xarun*, is represented in this colour; ⁶⁶ Polygnotus, too, in his wall-painting in the 'Lesche' of the Cnidians at Delphi, represented the demon Eurynomos, who devours corpses, with dark-blue skin (Pausanias 10, 28, 7).

With this underworld crew appear at the same place Fura and Furrina. The Roman goddess is connected with a companion of similar name and we find this the less surprising, as we have already met with a plurality of *Forinae*. Nor need the connexion with the underworld astonish us; the one point that we must emphasize as new is this, that among the goddesses named in our passage one at least appears, who is undoubtedly of Etruscan origin (Manturna). Perhaps, then, a similar origin might be shown for Fura and the kindred Furrina.

The names Furrina and Furinna remind us by their form of suffix of a common type of Etruscan gentile name; *Spurina*, *Spurinna*, *Barginna*, *Aulinna* &c.; the doubling of the first consonant in Furrina, too, has its Etruscan parallels (*Adius* : *Addius*, *Decius* : *Deccius*, *Pacius* : *Paccius*). More than this, we meet the same root in a series of Etruscan gentile names; *Πουρέννιος*, *purna*, *purni*, *Furinius*, *furnial*, *Furennianus* or *Purius*, *pura*, *Purellius*, *Πορέλλιος*. If we also take into account the variation between smooth and 'media' that we have already more than once observed, it becomes plain that the first group of names is derived from that of Furrina, the second from that of the kindred Fura. We have to deal, then, with 'theophoric' names, and the Etruscan formation and origin show that Furrina herself was once an Etruscan goddess. It looks as though with her we have met an Etruscan form of the Earth Mother, or, at least, on a closely kindred deity.

Further examples need not be sought; enough that we can establish an Etruscan group of deities within the earliest calendar. This result will not surprise us, if we remember that we have met with traces of Etruscan culture in the later stratum of the cemetery on the forum, in the graves of the *monti* and in the excavations at the *scalae Caciae*; in the naming of the Roman hills, too, we met an Etruscan element.

4. GREEK DEITIES

The presence of Etruscan deities within the earliest calendar has thus been confirmed in our last section from more than one side. But, more than this, I believe that I can show that among the gods of the oldest circle Greek gods also are to be found. They bear, however, without exception Latin or Etruscan names, and are not therefore recognizable at first sight. Up to now, in fact, it has been believed that they were only subsequently identified with Greek gods. On this view, Ceres, of whom we shall have to say more later, represented a goddess, who originally was common only to the Latins with the Oscans and who was therefore of purely Italian character. Only after the intrusion of the cult of Demeter did men proceed to identify the Greek goddess with the Italian. An intensive study of the earliest evidence and cults, however, has led me to a precisely opposite conclusion. Here I will restrict myself to detailing a few cases and briefly setting out the reasons, which have decided my view.

Volcanus seems to have been none other than the Greek god of fire, Hephaistos.⁶⁷ Like him, he is the fiery element itself; as such he appears when the weapons of the enemy are burned in his honour after the battle or when living animals are thrown into the fire to him. There are, moreover, a number of facts which point to the conclusion that he too had a relation to the earth and, like Hephaistos, was originally worshipped in the earth-fire, whether of volcanic or other origin. In this context Cacus, the enemy of Hercules, appears as his son; we are still able to prove that Virgil, in making him an underground demon, vomiting smoke and fire, has preserved the original account.

But, more than this, Volcanus, again like Hephaistos, is not only the fiery element itself, but also the lord of fire. He calls a halt to its fury, he knows how to use it for works of artistry; like Hephaistos, he is the divine smith. Not only in Rome, but also in Etruria does Volcanus (who, in the north, bears the name *seθlans*) appear in this capacity; Populonia and the neighbouring Elba, the island of the copper-mines, formed a centre of his worship. If, in the

oldest conception, Hephaistos seems to have been thought of as a dwarfish craftsman, Volcanus too meets us in a similar context. In Praeneste there appear as guardians of his son, Caeculus, deities, called *Digidii* or *Digitii*; they can only have been a race of divine dwarfs, 'thumblings', δάκτυλοι.⁶⁸

A group of feminine deities—Ceres, Tellus, and Flora—remind us by their very names of Demeter. She herself was none other than the Δῆ-μήτηρ, 'Mother Earth', and the same idea is expressed in Tellus. In the case of Flora we shall think of Demeter *Χλοῖη*. In the same way, Ceres (from *crescere, creare*) selects a particular side of the goddess, growth and earth's creative power; we might compare Demeter *φυσίζοος*. Similar forms of Ceres are present also in the Samnite cult of Agnone. There we meet in *Liganadikei* (dative singular, linked with the additional word *Entraí* or *Kerriai*) an analogy to Demeter θεσμοφόρος⁶⁹ or the mother-goddess as **Amma* (cp. Ἀμμάς = Demeter).⁷⁰ These are but two examples of many.

The decisive point, however, is that in nature as in name these Italian goddesses may be identified with Demeter.

Ceres⁷¹ is certainly not merely the goddess of growth in plants, as has been maintained. Like Demeter she has two sides—she makes all life spring from her bosom and takes back the dead and lost to herself again. In this second function Ceres appears in a number of cases. To her as to Dionysus, the lord of souls, worship is paid by the suspension of masks (*oscilla*);⁷² we are at once reminded of the well-attested use of masks in the cult of Demeter. Here too belongs the sacrifice of the pig, whether for the departed in general (*porca praecidanca*), or, especially, at the open grave (*porca praesentanea*); we have already met with it more than once before.⁷³ Of both rites it is expressly recorded in our tradition that they were due either to Ceres alone or to her in conjunction with Tellus. Similarly, the *mundus*, the seat of the cult of the dead and the link between the underworld and the world above, is placed in connexion with her. In the description as Panda Cela—as the power that reveals (*ea quae panditur*) and that conceals (*ea quae celat*)—this connexion found its special expression.⁷⁴ For the *mundus* itself can be conceived of from these two opposite points of

view. On the few days of the year on which it is opened it too reveals the hidden secrets of Hades, which at other times are shut up in darkness and withdrawn from human view. On the Greek side equally can this conception of the earth that opens and closes be attested.⁷⁶ In the case of Ceres a further peculiarity of ancient character appears, which in the case of the earth-mother in Greece is only to be seen in faint traces. The earth, as we have seen, is not only the giver of fruitfulness, a generous and kindly goddess, but also queen of the dead, a robber, an angry deity. Thus we find Ceres, like Hecate or the Mother of the gods, as the bringer of madness.⁷⁶ The Latin word *cerritus* denotes being smitten by a madness, sent by Ceres, just as, in the words of similar meaning *lymphatus* (νυμφόληπτος) and *larvatus*, the nymphs and the *larvae*, the ghosts of the underworld, appear as the bringers of madness. The glosses render *cerritus* as *Δημητρίοληπτος*; this confirms what we should have in any case to deduce—that Demeter too once possessed a similar power. In the prayer of the pious poet, *Δήμητερ ἡ θρέψασα τὴν ἐμὴν φρένα* (Arist., *Frogs* 886), we may still, perhaps, trace the contrast with that other Demeter, who can make *ἀφρων*.⁷⁷

What is true of Ceres is equally true of that other goddess, whom Wissowa among others tried to separate completely from her, Tellus or Terra Mater.⁷⁸ She again is identical with Demeter. First of all, she too appears as giver of the vegetation, as goddess of the sown field, 'that takes the seed and lets it develop in her bosom'. But, besides, Tellus appears again as queen of the dead; the sacrifice of the *porca praecidanea* is due to her in common with Ceres and, in the formula of 'devotion', the army of the enemy is dedicated *Telluri ac dis manibus*.⁷⁹ Here, then, appears again that contrast between the giving birth to the living and the concealing of the dead, that we have already encountered in the case of Ceres and, on the Greek side, of Demeter.

It is obvious that the identity of Ceres and Tellus is thus proved. This seems to us of special importance, inasmuch as we now have a means whereby we can work out in clearer outline such traces, as in the sphere of the one goddess survive only in isolation, and here too draw the lines

of connexion with Demeter. For example, the connexion of Terra Mater with the *aquae salubres* in the Secular Hymn of Horace (29 f.) and, in the same context, on the relief of the Ara Pacis, finds its counterpart in the appearance of the Samnite Ceres in Agnone with the nymphs (Oscan *diumpais kerriais*, dative plural) and in the fact that the same is true of Demeter. Again, if, in an isolated passage, a torch is said to have been born in honour of Ceres at a wedding and Ceres is thus designated as goddess of marriage, this evidence, which has hitherto been regarded as without meaning for the oldest nature of Ceres, now receives its confirmation through corresponding evidence for Tellus.

There is another point of very great importance. That Demeter, or, better the Greek earth-goddesses, in general, were once conceived of in the form of horses, has been shown by Wilamowitz and, above all, by Malten,⁸⁰ following him, in his exhaustive study. The same form of appearance can be proved for Ceres. In the earliest inscription that mentions our goddess, a Ceres-vase of the sixth century from Falerii, there appears twice the picture of a horse, by which only the goddess herself can be meant. So too with Tellus we find, not indeed identification with the horse, but a series of connexions with it; these confirm our conclusion and show that the identification of Ceres, Tellus, and Demeter is forced on us from this side as well as from others.⁸¹

To the same circle as Ceres and Tellus belongs Flora.⁸² In her case, too, we can demonstrate that same contrast that has been revealed to us again and again. By the side of her original significance as goddess of the flowering plants, her festival, the Floralia, has unmistakable connexions with the cult of the dead; in this it reminds us of the Athenian Anthesteria, which bear in their name the flowering of the plants and yet were at the same time a festival of the dead. One special feature deserves notice; at the Floralia the courtesans appeared in public. They carried out sham fights, a characteristic trait for the cult of feminine deities,⁸³ and, above all, stripped themselves and gave vent to all manner of indecent gestures and speeches. The custom is only attested for the later altered form of the Floralia in the third century and for the Greek games connected with it

(mimes), but certain indications make it probable that it went back to much earlier times. With this we get a parallel to the manifold mocking and jesting speeches, again, in part, of an indecent character, which are well known for the cult of Demeter, and, in particular, for the Attic Haloa; that the courtesans played a part in them may be regarded as probable. In Syracuse, where a similar rite existed, the practice of *αἰσχρολογία* was carried back to the act of the maid Iambe. She—and even more so the parallel figure, Baubo, in the Orphic tradition—is said to have succeeded, by ribaldry and indecent gestures, in making Demeter, sunk in grief for her stolen daughter, break into laughter and thus inducing her to accept the *κυνέων* that was offered her.⁸⁴

We may sum up by saying that Ceres, Tellus and Flora not only represent in a general way the Earth-Mother, but that they also, in a narrower sense, reflect in all her traits the figure of the Greek Demeter. In the form in which they appear in history they are identical with her.

This might seem to imply that, for the history of Roman religious history, in the special and most limited sense, any further discussion, penetrating into prehistoric times, had become unnecessary. In view, however, of the lively, and even passionate protest, that the view here sketched has provoked,⁸⁵ we must not evade one more question that arises. Is it really out of the question that the Italian peoples once possessed an Earth-Mother of their own? The question is as easy to pose as it is hard to answer. Yet a name as ancient in form as that of Tellus and as obscure in its etymological meaning should counsel caution.⁸⁶ So too should the fact that the Oscan *Líganakdíkēi* (dative singular), while it does seem to express the same function as *θεσμοφόρος*, does not give the impression of a special translation for the purpose, but rather of an ancient formation.⁸⁷ A consideration of general principles seems to be best designed to clear up the set of problems that thus arises.

Up to now the alternatives have been put thus: is it a case of Italian or adopted, that is to say, Greek, deities? Must native claims be accepted or rejected on general principles? Perhaps it might be advisable to think in categories of a less mutually exclusive nature. The science of religion,

in the last generation, has had at its root a conception of divinity, which could conceive of the powers of the ancient religions as creations of man himself, as projections of his innermost wishes, longings and hopes. Now that we to-day are once more remembering that gods are not creatures of their worshippers, but actual powers, that enter as such from without into human life, that they represent realities, not capriciously invented, but found in being,⁸⁸ the question from which we set out, must lead to a different conclusion.

We must no longer take the view that the Italians, for reasons of any external character, adopted any deity, strange to them in nature and nationality. In such a case there must have been displayed and, therewith, revealed to the barbarian people a deity that had hitherto been hidden from it. It was not so much in the superiority of the foreign culture that its compulsive power in this case consisted, but rather in the fact that with the figure of the new god contact was made with a reality which, once revealed, was forthwith understood as such.

From this point of view, the question whether a god was foreign or native must come to be meaningless as applied to the Italian and Roman. The deity enjoyed his dignity, not because he belonged to a particular culture, but simply and solely because he could be apprehended as a divine reality even by those who were at first strangers to him, that for these strangers too he rose above and beyond all human representations of him. That is why he could be recognized by all, Italians and Greeks alike. The difference was rather one of time than of race; one people had had the vision of the god earlier and independently, the other had had to wait for the guidance of leaders and masters.

The Italians too may have had their own imperfect conception of one or other of the deities, whom we have named, may have seen them in obscure vision and have worshipped them with simple, unskilled rites. When the Greeks came, it was discovered that on them too the divine reality had shone, but that, both in picture and in cult, it had been incomparably more plainly seen and worked out in more convincing and appealing forms. The simpler native forms could then be abandoned and the more perfect Greek forms

adopted without any sense that anything substantially alien had been appropriated.⁸⁹ What one had striven to see and conjure up for oneself now appeared in clearer and more comprehensible form. On the other hand, one could now add a characteristic or two from the native stock, a saga or detail of cult, perhaps. A foreign deity, then, at any rate in the first intention, was not incorporated and deliberately remade into a national. Here again the reality, already conceived and common to all, was rendered with more vividness and fullness than before.

The recent excavations at Agrigentum, which have enabled us to see the growth of a Greek city inside an Italo-Sicel environment,⁹⁰ make it possible to realize the process more clearly than before. North of the so-called temple of the Dioscuri has been discovered a whole sacred district—small cells, altars rectangular and round, trenches for sacrifice—which in historical times was dedicated to the goddesses Demeter and Persephone. In their origins, however, they go back into Sicel, that is to say, into prehistoric and pre-Greek times. What was the name of the deity there adored we do not know; but, when the new Dorian settlers made their homes in the seventh century beside the native place of worship, the Greek forms were taken over. This was not for any reason of an accidental or external nature; it was because those forms expressed in incomparably more impressive and complete fashion what had already been imagined and worshipped there. Only on this assumption can we explain the two facts that, on the one hand, there was continuity in cult, while, on the other, all specifically Sicel characteristics could later disappear.⁹¹

With these deities, Volcanus, Ceres, Tellus and Flora, we have hardly yet exhausted the number of the cults in which we have to consider the adoption of Greek forms. Of Liber especially we may well guess that he was of Greek origin.

All those details, in which hitherto his special character as an Italian deity has been seen, are revealed on closer scrutiny as allusions to Dionysos.⁹² There is, in particular, one wide sphere in which the two gods came into the closest contact, that of the masks. The Attic 'god of masks' has been made real to us by the essay of W. Wrede.⁹³ This is

paralleled on the Roman side by the custom of hanging up *oscilla*, that is to say Dionysiac masks, at the Liberalia.⁹⁴ That conclusions may be drawn from this custom about the original function of the mask in the cult of Dionysos, its chthonic meaning, and the rôle that the mask plays at the festival of the dead, the Anthesteria, I have detailed in full in another place.⁹⁵ The god appears here as the lord of the souls of the dead, which rise in swarms from the earth at the beginning of spring.

Of decided importance for the age of Dionysos in Rome is the proof that has recently been presented, that *Mater Matuta*, who belongs to the earliest order of the gods, is identical with the Greek *Ino-Leucothea*.⁹⁶ In both cases, we have to do with a mother-goddess, whose divine nature is developed on one particular side, in her care for the children. In both cases the closest connexions with the cult of Dionysos are revealed.⁹⁷

For *divus pater Falacer*, too, who also appears within Messapian religion,⁹⁸ the question has been raised⁹⁹ whether he does not stand in some connexion or other with Zeus *φάλακρος*. With what possibilities we have, in general, to reckon, the name of the month *Aprilis* will show. The ancients derived it from the name of Aphrodite, who appears also as *Ἀφρώ* and *Ἀφροδα*. This derivation has in recent times been so well supported by linguistic arguments that it may count as assured. Though neither Aphrodite nor Venus appears in the earliest calendar, yet a month is named after Aphrodite.¹⁰⁰ The case is no more remarkable than that of the derivation of the *mensis Maius* from *Jupiter Maius*, who again does not appear in Rome, but only in the neighbouring Tusculum.¹⁰¹

Another question that deserves closer investigation is whether Saturnus was from the first identical with Kronos. Similar are the conditions for Neptunus, for whom we should have to consider identity with Poseidon. In both cases, the arguments that were thought to be adducible to prove original Italian character are extraordinarily scanty and, in hardly a single case, really valid. However that may be, we have at any rate fresh confirmation that our divine order is by no means confined to native Roman or Latin cults.

Within the very earliest stratum that we can see forms of the Greek world of gods appear, not isolated but in complete groups.

Finally, a word is due on the circle of Greek deities, who appear in the earliest order of festivals. If we confine ourselves to those five *numina*, whose origin appears certain, we remark at once the purely external fact, that the appearances of Demeter—that is to say, of Ceres, Tellus and Flora—predominate. And it is not the mother of Persephone, the goddess, who appears in the Homeric Hymn as the embodiment of human motherhood, but the purely elemental force, 'Mother Earth'. Beside her stands Hephaistos, the lord of the earth-fire, the smith who dwells and labours in the interior of the earth, again a chthonic god. To them may be added Dionysos, who in spring brings the flowers of the earth, but also brings the swarms of the dead, who at his leading rise up from their seats in darkness. He too belongs to this sphere; 'the primitive traits of the chthonic deity are with him carried to their extreme, but also to their fullest meaning'.¹⁰² We appear, then, to have a clearly defined, closed circle of Greek deities finding their place within the earliest Roman cult.

Its exclusive attachment to the earth need not surprise us. It is the very circle that in the divine world of Homer only enjoyed a relatively minor importance. Demeter and Dionysos—Homer knew them right well, but their form is not consistent with that spiritual clarity which for him is inseparable from the representation of the truly divine. They only appear in occasional allusions, or, when they, like Hephaistos, have their fixed place in the epic; they could not therefore rise to true dignity or divine majesty.¹⁰³

In other words, the only Greek gods that we meet in earliest Rome are those of the pre-Homeric world. For them, in particular, it is characteristic that they are in one way or another bound to the earth; earth in her twofold activity, generation and birth on the one hand, death on the other, is the power that rules that world. This fettering to earth separates them from the gods of Homer, who are attached to no element and stand far from death.

The decisive event in the religious history of Greece, the

ousting of the ancient powers and the creation of a new classical world of gods, thus begins to be reflected as in a mirror on the Italian side; the course of history in both spheres was, it seems, a comparable one. Our final judgment must be deferred until we have realized the other side of the picture, the appearance of the Homeric deities, Apollo, Artemis, Athena. But this we may at least say, that our dating of the earliest Roman calendar to the beginning of the sixth century (which we shall have to justify more fully in our next section) corresponds as perfectly as could be wished with all that we know of the chronology on the Greek side.

If those pre-Homeric deities had already their fixed place in the Roman order of festivals at the beginning of the sixth century, they must have reached Italy in the course of the seventh century at latest. Of the way by which they came and of the possibilities of dating their coming in detail we shall have to speak later. Certainly the results that we have already obtained would agree with the gradual advance of the cult of Dionysos, as we can observe it in Greece from the eighth century on. If Hephaistos and Demeter in their origin project into an earlier period,¹⁰⁴ we may remind ourselves in the case of Ceres, that we have met with traces of her cult in the older stratum of the cemetery on the forum. Perhaps, too, with all reserve be it suggested, the form of the Earth-Mother in Rome too looks back to a higher antiquity. So also in Sicily her worship goes back to a very early time.

On the other hand, the Ionian epic, in its beginnings at least, extends back beyond the seventh century. The creation of a new world of gods, which is expressed in it, must also go back to a similar age. That in the Italian west it made its way with less speed and more hesitation needs to be noted and will be discussed later in the light of its special causes. Here we need only remind our readers that the figure of Odysseus, for example, as his name in Latin, *Ulixes*, shows, cannot have reached Rome by way of the Ionian epic. Nor must we forget that the Homeric poetry did not find an echo in the Greek motherland until the beginning of the seventh century. The work of Hesiod

particularly shows how completely different a form the epic now took, how well the ancient powers of the earth succeeded in maintaining their place by the side of the Homeric gods.

5. CALENDAR AND HISTORY OF THE CITY

A final question awaits an answer. If the earliest circle of Roman gods was not that of the *indigites* (in the sense of Wissowa), a closed circle of native cults, what is the meaning of the strict limitation of the order, of the refusal to extend it in later times? To this question there can be only one answer. What we have is the codification, at a definite moment of history, of the cycle of festivals and cults then in vogue. But of what precise moment have we to think?

Here we must once more have recourse to the history of the city of Rome. We saw that the union of the different settlements on Roman soil began with the closer union entered upon by the Palatine community with that of the Esquiline. As a religious evidence of this act we recognized the festival of the Septimontium. In the calendar the development has gone a step farther. When Quirinus appears in it, that implies that the hill, which from of old represented the seat of the god and got its name from him, the Quirinal, was already incorporated in the city union. Further confirmation is supplied by the appearance of Sol Indiges, whose place of worship, as far as we know it, was localized from the outset on the same hill. When we hear that the *gens Aurelia*, which devoted a special cult to Sol, was of Sabine origin, that agrees with the seat of Sol Indiges on the Sabine Quirinal.¹⁰⁵

In other words, the earliest calendar is the codification of that ritual of festivals that corresponds to a stage of the development of the city of Rome, which embraced not only the Septimontium, but the Quirinal also. The Capitol, on the other hand, still lay outside the new city-bounds, for we have already seen that the foundation of the Capitoline sanctuary was still unknown to the calendar. The hill itself then was not yet included. This picture of the city of the earliest calendar looks, it must be admitted, more like a

reconstruction than a genuinely historical stage of development. Yet, against this, we should note that recently a similar result has been reached from an entirely different side.

To F. Noack¹⁰⁶ we owe the momentous observation that the occasion for the bringing of the Capitol within the city-bounds was given 'when the regulation of the brook in the forum and the thorough draining of that depression, that had hitherto as marshland separated Palatine and Velia from the Capitoline Hill, had made it a fit place to satisfy the most diverse social and political demands'. The forum itself, however, lay, especially on its north and north-western edge, far too much inside the immediate sphere of the Capitol, for it to have been possibly omitted from inclusion within the frame of the city.

We still know the forerunner of the Capitoline sanctuary, the so-called *Capitolium vetus*, dedicated, like the later one, to the triad of Jupiter, Juno and Minerva. This older Capitol, too, does not appear in the calendar of festivals. More remarkable is the fact, that it lay not on the Capitoline Hill, but on the Quirinal. This means—we see it once again—that the former hill was not yet drawn within the boundaries of the commonwealth.

We may assert, then, that before the erection of the Capitoline temple and the inclusion of the hill and of the forum that it commands in the unity of the city, there was an age when that included only Septimontium and Quirinal. But this is the very picture that we deduced from the earliest calendar; the two results confirm one another. The possibility of exact dating is also supplied. So long as the forum was largely a cemetery—and that was the case until the first decades of the sixth century—it could serve neither as market nor place of assembly nor could it be included in the city-territory proper. The change, then, must fall in the first decades of that century and with this we can excellently harmonize the fact that the beginning of the Capitoline temple is placed by our tradition under Tarquinius Priscus, the draining of the forum by the building of the Cloaca Maxima only under Tarquinius Superbus. As a date, then, for the decisive extension of the city we must set down the

period from about the middle to the end of the sixth century. Into the space before that period the calendar must fall.

We may perhaps be able to define the relationship in time of the earliest calendar to that form of the city, which consisted of Septimontium and Quirinal, somewhat more precisely. If the *Capitolium vetus* presumes the same form of the city as the calendar, but yet does not appear in it, we must not only assume that the calendar is older than the shrine, but also that the foundation of the *Capitolium vetus* must be placed more towards the end of the epoch characterized by that form of the city, the calendar, on the other hand, more towards its beginning. From here it is but a short step to the assumption, that the calendar represents a codification of the ritual of festivals, designed to be valid for the newly formed community after the completion of the union of Septimontium and Quirinal.

An extensive codification, for the Rome of the sixth century at least, is an event of some moment. There must have been some very special occasion to dictate the resolve to undertake so unusual a measure. Such an occasion was undoubtedly presented by the inclusion within the city-whole of the last settlement that had so far remained independent; at that very moment it was necessary to set about determining the regulations which were in future to rule the community. Whether corresponding codifications of legal and political nature went with it or whether men confined themselves for the time to religious unity, is for our present purpose a matter of indifference.

The order of festivals and gods, here revealed, in great part certainly goes back to what had already been usual in the older, independent settlements. Under the historical conditions that could not but be the case. The decisive point is that, over and above this, the calendar is revealed as a deliberate arrangement, which was unmistakably aimed and adapted to suit a larger community. The needs of such a community are above all considered in the arrangement and distribution of festivals, in which we see clearly that festivals connected with one another fall into certain groups. A. v. Domaszewski has set us an example of observations of this kind.¹⁰⁷ We must admit that, in our view, his argu-

ments contain a kernel of truth, however vigorous and, in part, justifiable, may be the opposition that they have encountered in some quarters. At this stage we can only refer to a few points; systematic research will certainly lead to further advance.

The case may be seen at its clearest in the months of March and October. The first of these is actually named after the god, Mars, and, accordingly, his festivals go on right through the month, beginning at the end of February (Equirria on the 27th). We have days of Mars on the 1st and the 14th (Equirria), on the 17th and the 19th (Quinquatrus) and on the 23rd (Tubilustrium). To them correspond in October the day of the *equus October* (15), on which the right-hand horse of the pair victorious in the race was sacrificed, and the Armilustrium (19); to the former corresponds the Equirria, to the latter the Quinquatrus. It has long been recognized that the review of weapons and war-horns, and no less the ritual horse-races, are connected with the setting out of the army in spring and with its return in autumn. The activities of the community, directed from the outset principally to war, here found their expression. Further, if the Fontinalia immediately precede the day of the October horse, we shall have to think not only of the close and constantly recurring connexion between horse and fountain,¹⁰⁸ but also of the fact that that festival was celebrated close by a shrine that itself lay on the Campus Martius.¹⁰⁹

In close connexion stand February and May, both devoted to the dead. The name of the month of February was brought by ancient tradition into connexion with a god of the dead, Februs, who is equated with Dispatēr, but who is probably identical with Faunus. For nine whole days in this month was celebrated the festival of the Parentalia; only the final day, the Feralia on the 21st, belongs to the *feriae publicae* and alone, therefore, was recorded in the calendar. Inseparable from it is the Lupercalia, the festival of Faunus, on which at the season of the festival of the dead the people were purified from evil; ¹¹⁰ the day (15) falls in the middle of the Parentalia. In May, on the other hand, the Lemuria (9, 11 and 13), as also the day of Veiovis (21), belong to

the gods of the underworld. The Tubilustrium, too, of Volcanus (28), the companion in cult of Maia, is connected by the *tuba* with the cult of the dead; we all know how the trumpet played an important part therein.¹¹¹

In July falls the celebration of the Neptunalia (23), standing in the middle of a circle of connected festivals (Lucaria on the 19th and 21st, Furrinalia on the 25th). Remarkable is the fact that August, on precisely the same days of the month, shows a group of festivals, which are grouped round the Volcanalia on the 23rd. Near the day which was given to the goddess of the earth and the earth-fire appears the festival of the vintage (Vinalia on the 19th), as also the festival of Consus and the associated Ops (21 and 25); all of them were devoted to the harvest and, therewith, to the fruits of the earth.

The festivals of April are related to the vegetation of the earth, and, above all, to the diverse forms of the Earth-Mother. We have here the festival of Tellus, the Fordicidia (15), and the Cerealia (19); beside them comes the Vinalia, called *priora*, to distinguish it from the August festival, when the new wine was first tasted (corresponding to the Attic *Πιθολύα*), and the Robigalia (25), on which prayer was made to avert mildew from the corn-harvest. On the last days of the month or on the first of May fell, as a rule, the Floralia, which, at the time of the earliest calendar, were perhaps reckoned among the *feriae conceptivae*.

Similar is the case with December. To it belongs a number of festivals, which once again stand in connexion with the earth and vegetation. First we have the Consualia (15), which here again are followed by a day of Ops (19); that the Diva Angerona, who was celebrated on the 21st, was a chthonic deity we have already guessed. Here too belong the Larentalia (23) and the *Compitalia*, which fall among the *feriae conceptivae*. Both days are devoted to the honour of the Lares, the first especially to the goddess Larentina, who was also designated Mother of the Lares and, in this capacity, was called Mania; she cannot have been far removed from the Manes.¹¹² Notice has long since been drawn to an extensive parallelism between the festivals of December and those of August. Not only do we find corres-

pondence in the rites paid to Consus and Ops, but in both cases two festivals of the sun introduce and close the circle.¹¹⁸

One word more on January. It gets its name from the god of all beginnings, Janus, whose festival falls on the ninth of the month. Immediately upon it follow the Carmentalia on the 11th and the 15th, which have reference to the goddess of birth, Carmenta. Perhaps we have here a two-sided relationship, inasmuch as every birth implies a beginning; the oldest temple of Janus, too, lay in front of the Porta Carmentalis. We should also remember that the festival of sowing, the *feriae sementivae* (belonging to the *feriae conceptivae*), also fell in January; again it is a question of beginning, in this case of earthly growth.

These indications will suffice to establish the view expressed above. We recognize a deliberate order, a shaping of the ritual of festivals on a formal plan to suit definite conceptions. That is only intelligible, if conscious creation played a part, at least, in the arrangement. Whether this was the creation of an individual or of a group cannot be determined and has no importance in the present context. The decisive point in our view is that this creation proceeded from a definite historical situation and served a definite historical purpose.

Chapter III

THE ORIGIN OF THE EARLIEST CIRCLE OF GODS

THE calendar of festivals represents the earliest document of Roman religion that has come down to us in literature. But it has long since been recognized that it was certainly no original product, but the result of a historical process, the single stages of which can still here and there be distinguished.

We have realized with especial clearness the contrast between native, Latin or Roman gods and those that came from abroad, whether from the neighbouring Etruria or from Greece. But, even if we neglect this division and, for the time, leave on one side the foreign deities, the group that is left still does not represent any homogeneous whole. Wissowa has already seen that Portunus originally represented no more than an offshoot from Janus.¹ The former god, then, only attained independent existence in the second place; we get a glimpse into an epoch which lies before the composition of the calendar, in which the separation off of a single deity from the sphere that envelops him can be observed. Again we have been reminded that a series of festivals is not named after special gods, like the Opalia, Larentalia, Consualia, Furrinalia, but gives expression to the special character of the cult ceremony. The name of the festival of the Agonium, for example, originally expresses the sacrifice as such; this explains how it is that the days on which it appears in the calendar (9 January, 17 March, 21 May, 11 December) could belong to no fewer than four separate deities (Janus, Mars, Veiovis, Sol Indiges). Or, again, the Quinquatrus of the 19th March are originally a mere designation of date, stating that one has to do with the fifth day after the full moon. So too the Armilustrium, Equirria, Poplufugium, Regifugium, Tubilustrium, record not the name

of a god, but the character of the business of the festival; the Equus October is actually named after the animal sacrificed. Herein too one might recognize, albeit with much greater caution, a succession of distinct historical layers.*

Apart from all this there is yet another path that we can strike, by which we can link up with the course of our previous inquiry.

1. THE DEITIES OF THE OLDEST ROMAN SETTLEMENTS

The starting-point for our inquiry into the pre-history of the oldest order of cults and festivals is supplied by the history of the city. If it is true that Rome arose from two originally separate settlements, and, further, if the earliest calendar represents the codification of the cults in use after the union of the two, the question is at once suggested to us, whether distinct deities of the oldest circle cannot be assigned to particular settlements.

We have already been able to point out one or two facts of this kind. If the name of Pales lurks in those of Palatium and Palatine, it follows that this Etruscan deity must have come in with the cremating people. The same is true of Volcanus, whose oldest place of cult lay within the cremating cemetery of the forum. Similar is the case with Consus; his altar was in the *vallis Murcia*, south-west of the Palatine, at the spot where the Circus Maximus was later built. The altar was under the ground and covered with earth; this reminds us of the earliest way of hiding the fruits of the field, and the god, in fact, gets his name from the 'hiding' (*condere*) of the harvest.

Even clearer is the reference to the Palatine city given by Faunus. His festival is the Lupercalia, of the 15th of February. The most important element in this festival, the course of the Luperci, the priests of the god, took place round the Palatine Hill, and only there. It began with the sacrifice of a goat; with the fleece of the slaughtered beast the participants girded themselves and so, without other clothing, completed their course. The custom is only intelligible

when the city had an extent not going beyond that of this single hill. As further confirmation we have the fact that the priests were divided into two sections, the *Luperci Fabiani* and *Quinctiales* (or *Quintiliani*). Both were originally gentile societies ² and it is of importance that the *Fabiani* point to the settlement on the Quirinal. They cannot be separated from the *gens Fabia*, which, in its gentile tradition, is connected both with the cult of Faunus and with the Lupercalia ⁴ and in its origin belongs to the Quirinal city.⁵ As, however, the functions of both societies, the *Fabiani* included, are related only to the Palatine, the conclusion of Wissowa must hold good, that, after the union of the Quirinal community with the Palatine, the priesthood of the *Fabii* as representatives of the former was added.⁶

Again then we come upon a god who was originally localized on the Palatine. One point more deserves attention. Indissolubly connected with Faunus and the Luperci is the Lupercal, the 'cave of the wolf', which lies at the foot of the Palatine. Here, according to the legend, the sons of Mars, Romulus and Remus, were suckled by the she-wolf; here lay the *figus Ruminalis* and the *porta Romana*, which leads to the Tiber and cannot be separated from its Etruscan name, *Rumon*; to the same context belongs the goddess *Diva Rumina*, who was worshipped on the Palatine. At the base of all these formations lies a root **rum-*, **Rôm-*, which appears again in the name of Romulus, of Rome herself and of the Etruscan gentile name, **ruma*, therein concealed.⁷ It is certainly no accident, then, that the legend of the founder of the city was linked to this locality, even as, on the other hand, the connexion of the father of the twins, the wolf-god Mars, with the like-shaped Faunus has long since been recognized.⁸ We seem also to arrive at the conclusion that the name of Rome herself was originally attached to the Palatine. The ancient tradition will here again have preserved the true account.

On the other side stand such deities as were originally localized on the Sabine settlements of the *Monti*.

Here we shall have to mention Flora. Her ancient shrine lay on the Quirinal hill, and Varro, accordingly, reckoned her among the deities of Sabine origin, whose altars Titus

Tatius is said to have established in Rome (*de l. l.* 5, 74). Actually we only find her, apart from Rome, among the cousins of the inhumating Sabines, the Oscans and the Sabelian tribes of the middle Apennines. Both her festival (*Fiu-usasiats* = 'Floralibus') and her name (*Fluusaí kertiai*, dative, singular) appear on the Samnite inscription of Agnone; ⁹ we find dedications on inscriptions in Southern Umbria and along the upper course of the Anio, a month named after her in Amiternum and among the Vestini of Furfo. In her case, too, we may assume that the inhabitants of the Quirinal adopted her from their kinsmen or brought her with them when they migrated to Roman soil.

Similar is the case of Quirinus. It has been supposed that his name and that of *Quirites*, that cannot be separated from it, are to be derived from a place-name **Quirium*, after which the Quirinal in its turn was named; **Quirium* is supposed to have lain on the hill itself and the two names are related as *Palatium* and *Palatine*. But *Quirinalis* comes not from **Quirium* but from *Quirinus*. This original connexion of Quirinus with the Quirinal can be reinforced by another argument. The service of the god in Rome was always limited to this hill.

There he possessed a very ancient *sacellum* . . . *inter antiquissima* . . . *delubra habetur*, says Pliny, *n. h.*, 15, 120—beside which in the year 298 an incomparably richer temple was erected.

Quirinus is god of war—he was the war-god of the community of the Quirinal; Mars had no cult there. The suggestion, then, is forced on us that the two communities from which Rome arose worshipped two distinct gods of war—the Quirinal Quirinus, the Palatine Mars. In favour of this we may adduce the fact that Faunus, so closely connected with Mars, belongs to the Palatine. Thus the priesthood of the *Salii* was divided into the Palatine and the Colline (after the *collis Quirinalis*); as the former were devoted to Mars, so were the latter to the cult of Quirinus. Both groups remained distinct even after the *συνουκισμός*; they formed an analogy to the similar division of the *luperci*.

Yet in one point more can this original separation be observed. Before the Capitoline Triad, which we have still

to discuss, went another Triad, including Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus. By the side of the supreme god, in whose cult the two Roman settlements united, stood the two war-gods, which had once been proper to each.

The history of Mars demands a closer discussion. Until quite recently the view has found expression that he is one of those deities, for whom primitive Italian origin is certain ; or, to put it in other words, that he already belonged to the people of the Italians, when it still dwelt in its first homes and had not yet, divided into its two branches, set foot on the Apennine peninsula. The fact that in historical times Mars was worshipped among all the peoples of the Italians seems at first to confirm this view. But, if he was indeed a primitive Italian god, we should have to expect him to be worshipped not only on the Palatine, but also in the community of the Quirinal and Esquiline from the outset. Two views, then, seem to stand in conflict. Fortunately we have at our disposal yet another criterion which allows us to attack the problem from the side from which the conception of 'primitive Italian' is derived—the linguistic side.

We must, then, interrogate the name of the god, to tell us its origin. In Latin the oldest form is *Mavors*, and we may assume that *Mārs* arose from it by linguistic law.¹⁰ The other Italian tribes know only the form *Mars*, with the exception of the Oscans, for whom *Māmers* is attested both in literature and inscriptions as the name of the god.¹¹ As primitive Italian form **Mavers* has been conjectured, from which on the one hand the Latin *Māvors*, on the other *Māmers*, by assimilation, has arisen.

But, if we look closer, difficulties arise. *Māvors* from **Māvers* would represent a sound-change for which no analogies can be adduced. Moreover, we can indeed reach the form *Mārs* from Latin *Māvors* but not from **Māvers*, still less from *Māmers* ; yet this form is found in the Osco-Umbrian dialects. With this, the supposed primitive Italian form **Māvers* falls to the ground and, with it, the whole question whether we have to do with a primitive Italian god.

The development of the form of the name, *Mārs* from *Māvors*, and the form, *Mārs*, itself, can only be understood from the Latin side.¹² But how did the Oscan form of the name come into being ?—We must, I think, strike a path quite distinct from that hitherto attempted. For *Māmers* the right point of departure seems to lie in the form *Marmar*, by which the god is invoked in the very ancient hymn of the Roman Arval Brethren (*fratres*

Arvales); scholars have long since set it beside the Homeric **Agēs* **Agēs* (Σ 455). We may remember that in other cases, too, the formation of a new nominative from an isolated vocative has taken place. W. Schulze has proved this for the name of Hercules.¹³ A similar new formation seems, then, in this case, too, not to be out of the question. We should then reach a reduplicated form: **Marmers* or, if we assume for *Marmar*, on the analogy of **Agēs* **Agēs*, a certain independence of its parts: **Mars-mars*. This would have in Latin to become **Māmars* or, with weakening of the vowel, *Māmers*; we may compare Latin *cēna* from **cers-nā*, Oscan *kerssnāis*.¹⁴

This would have to imply that not only *Mārs*, but also the form *Māmers*, was originally a Latin one. The weakening of the vowel in the second syllable from *a* to *e*, of which we have spoken, for which there is, at least, no valid analogy in Oscan,¹⁵ must render this probable. In this case, the name will have only passed subsequently into the Oscan dialect and have supplanted the older *Mārs*, which is still present in the name of the *Marsi* (from **Marthi*).¹⁶ In any case, it will be obvious that the emigrants, who called themselves Mamertini after Mamers and who settled in Messana in the year 282 B.C., are considerably later than the *Marsi*, who named themselves after Mars.

If it appeared, then, that in Rome only the Latin community on the Palatine knew a cult of Mars and that on the Quirinal they worshipped another god in his stead, this historical result has now found confirmation. We have come upon the fact that Mars is no primitive Italian god, but originally a possession of the Latin race alone. Only from them have the Umbro-Sabellian peoples adopted him, but in very early times, as the name of the *Marsi* or of the *Picentines* proves, who named themselves after the god and his sacred bird, the woodpecker (*picus*). The same is true also of the *Etruscans*; they too adopted the god, who appears thereafter in the Etruscan pantheon in the form *maris*.¹⁷

The discussion of Mars, which was at first directed solely to his connection with special Roman settlements, has led us to transgress the bounds of our narrower inquiry. The most ancient communities on Roman soil pointed the way to the two Italian races, which settled in the peninsula in prehistoric times. A second deity, Vesta, leads us again to a similar problem.

Vesta had her seat in Rome on what was later the forum. The conclusion has been suggested that she can only have

received her cult there after the place itself had been included within the city bounds.¹⁸ This would conflict with the fact that she is mentioned in the earliest calendar. Otherwise we should have to suppose that this calendar corresponds to a later stage of the development of the city than that which we have assumed. But, if we look closer, we shall see that the temple of Vesta lies on the slope of the Velia, the later house of the Vestals (*atrium Vestae*) actually on the Velia itself. But the Velia is to be understood as a suburb of the Palatine settlement. Nor can it be accident that the altars of the two deities connected with fire, Volcanus and Vesta, lie on this side and that of the old cremation cemetery on what was later the forum.

The cult of Vesta, then, belongs to the cremating, that is to say, to the Latin race. And the Roman tradition points in the same direction, when it makes the goddess spring originally from the neighbouring Lavinium. The local cult was in later times marked out as the mother-cult of the Roman. It belonged to the *sacra principia p(opuli) R(omani) Quirit(ium) nominisque Latini, quai apud Laurentis coluntur* (CIL 10, 797); the highest officials of Rome solemnly made sacrifice there every year. In Alba Longa, too, there was a very old cult of Vesta. It outlasted the destruction of the city and, like the Laurentine, was regarded as mother-cult of the Roman.

All traces of the goddess, then, lead us to Latium; we might also remind ourselves of the *virgines Vestales Tiburtium*, though indeed they are not mentioned before the imperial age.¹⁹ A decision of the question had, in fact, already been reached on these lines. Only in very recent times has a point been emphasized which seemed to point in a different direction.

The Umbrian word for the offering of a sacrifice is preserved in forms like *vestilatu* 'libato', *vesticos* 'libaverit', and derived forms. P. Kretschmer²⁰ has tried to demonstrate as the original meaning of this Umbrian verb, which would correspond to a Latin **vesticare*, not to 'sacrifice' merely, but to 'sacrifice to Vesta'. In that case it would be derived from the name of Vesta and we should find an ancient cult of the goddess not only among the Latins, but among the Umbrians too. Kretschmer further brings in the name of the *Vestini*, which he interprets as meaning 'worshippers of Vesta', like the *Mamertini*, who were 'worshippers

of Mars'. In that case an original cult of Vesta would be proved for a Sabellian tribe too.

Supposing Kretschmer's views to be correct, the opinion that we have expressed of the origin of the goddess has been refuted in a decisive point. We should no longer be able to talk of a specifically Latin deity; Vesta would be common from the first to the Latins and their Umbro-Sabellian cousins. Can we really hope, then, to have here, what we failed to achieve for Mars, the discovery of a primitive Italian deity? A closer look must again dispose us to be more cautious in our judgement.

Let us begin with the name of the Vestini. To interpret it as 'worshippers of Vesta' is certainly in itself permissible enough. But we must be clear that in doing so we separate the name of the tribe from the gentile names *Vestius*, *Vestilius*, *Vestuleius*, *Vestorius*. At the base of all of them lies a root **ves-*, which, with a second formative element, appears in *Vesennius*, *Vesenus*, *Vesnius*, *Vesius*, *Veselius*, *Vesullius*, &c.²¹ In the same context we should mention the *saltus Vescinius* and the city of *Vescia* in the land of the Aurunci, the divine eponym of which appears in the form *veskei* (dative singular) on the Samnite list of gods of Agnone (Planta, no. 200; Conway, no. 175).²²

For the Umbrian *vestikatu* and *vesticos* Kretschmer himself has called attention to a difficulty. 'There exists . . . the possibility that not the name of the goddess, but the substantive *vesta*, "hearth", lies at the root of the word, and that the word properly meant to "sacrifice on the hearth", "make a hearth-sacrifice", in which connexion we have to remember that every Roman sacrifice began with an offering of incense and wine on the hearth'.²³ That this interpretation, here presented as a mere possibility, is actually the only one worth serious attention is proved by a further consideration.

Kretschmer has brought the verb **vesticare*—originally, 'to offer to Vesta', then, generalized to mean 'to offer' simply into connexion with a number of other phrases formed from the names of deities, where a similar generalization of meaning seemed to him to occur. Thus '*indigitare*', 'to invoke the *di indigetes*' becomes 'to invoke in prayer' in general; *parentare*, 'to honour parents by an offering to the dead', becomes 'to offer a sacrifice to the dead'; *venerari*, 'to worship Venus', becomes 'to pay religious reverence'; *sancire*, 'to invoke Sancus', becomes 'to asseverate in solemn form'. But, if we look closer, we find that very diverse cases are here collected. In the case of *parentare* and *sancire* no generalization of meaning has occurred; for at every sacrifice to the dead we have to conceive of the sum total or of certain of the *parentes* as present, at every *sanctio* of the god of oaths, of Semo Sancus as present; the religious force of this fact appears with evidence here. The same explanation has recently been successfully given for *indigitare*. Only if all Roman

deities were once 'fathers' and 'fathers of the race' (that is what *indigites* means), does the use of the verb for the invocation of a god in general become intelligible.²⁴ In the case of *venerari* and *vesticare*, and of them only, would there be a generalization of meaning, which, beginning with definite deities, gradually extended to cover the whole body of gods.

In the very case of *venerari*, however, the true way in which the verb was derived from the substantive *venus* has long since been realized. It is completely satisfactory, without any need to assume a generalization of the meaning. That this derivation does not do justice to the predominating religious meaning of the word does not imply any decisive objection.²⁵ In Greek we have a perfect analogy in *χαρίζεσθαι*,²⁶ derived from *χάρις*, the meaning of which corresponds exactly to *venus*. The Greek word too can be employed in the religious sphere; cp. Hesiod, *Theog.* 580, (of Hephaistos) *χαριζόμενος Διὶ πατρὶ*; Xenophon, *Mem.* 1, 33, *τοῖς θεοῖς κχαριζόμενα*; *Athen. Mitt.* 18, 416 *ἐχαρίσατο Μῆτιν θεῶν*. If we regard the 'veneration' of the gods as a similar *χαρίζεσθαι*, the Latin word would at once find its completely satisfying explanation. But with this would go the last support for the derivation of the word **vesticare* from the name of Vesta.²⁷

The result, then, is that Vesta, again, cannot be demonstrated as a primitive Italian deity. The only case in which such a view can be maintained with some prospect of success is that of Jupiter. We have already seen that his cult was common to the different Roman settlements, and that, therefore, in the Triad, Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus, he is placed before the war-gods of the Palatine and Quirinal communities. With Jupiter we have to do with one of the oldest of the Indo-German gods, even if he cannot be assigned to the primitive Indo-Germanic period.²⁸ The name of **Dieu-pater* cannot be separated from the Greek Zeus, the ancient Indian *Dyaus* and the Thraco-Phrygian *Διως*, *Δεως*, the Messapian *Δειωατρωπος*.²⁹ Further, the same root in a somewhat altered form appears in the Etruscan *tin*, *tinia*, and also in various designations of the sky-god in the pre-Greek religions of Asia Minor.³⁰ In prehistoric times, then, the cult of this god spread over a series of peoples, partly of Indo-Germanic, partly of non-Indo-Germanic origin.

Our problem, then, is to this extent modified, that we have now to direct our attention to the question, whether that god was already known to the Italians in primitive Italic

times, or whether it was not before they were settled in their historic homes. A linguistic argument seems to speak decidedly in favour of the former possibility. The name of *Jupiter*, Umbrian *Jupater*, is composed of the root **Dieu-*, which only appears in the oblique cases (*Diovis*, *Diovi*, &c.), and *pater*. At its base lies a vocative **Dieu pater*, which may be compared with the Greek *Ζεῦ πάτερ*. The middle form **Diou-pater*, which we must postulate, shows, in its first part, the name of the god proper, the change from *eu* to *ou*, which is characteristic of all Italic dialects. This sound-change has hitherto been regarded as primitive Italian, and it was natural, therefore, to transfer the name of *Jupiter* and, with it, the god himself to the primitive Italian age. And yet this argument proves to be illusory. We can assert with certainty that the sound-change in question only took place on Italian soil, that is to say, that it is not primitive, but common Italian.³¹ But this implies that no positive evidence can be given for the view that *Jupiter* was a primitive Italian deity.³² We must reckon instead with the possibility that the god **Dieus* only became known to the Italians on the soil of the Apennine peninsula.

2. THE RECEPTION OF THE ETRUSCAN DEITIES

In the oldest calendar we encountered a series of deities with Etruscan names. We must remember, in the first place, that ancient Etruria extended right up to the gates of Rome. Immediately beyond the Tiber, at the Janiculum, begins the frontier; here too was the seat of *Furrina*, whom we have already learned to know as an Etruscan deity. On the other side of the river was *Fidenae*, from of old a bridge-head of the Etruscans; *Veii* is said to have placed it there.

Special comment is demanded by a series of Etruscan gentile deities, whom we have met with in the most ancient circle. Of the cults of single *gentes* in Rome we have some other information.³³ Thus we hear of a special sacrifice of the *gens Fabia* on the Quirinal hill; we hear also of an ancestral heroine, on whom *Hercules* begat the first *Fabius*. **Herulus* or *Erulus* was the ancestor of the *gens Feronia*; his mother was named after it and is thereby marked out as a

special deity of the *gens*. In Atina was worshipped a god *Numiternus*; he was also called Mars and was the gentile god of the *Numitorii*, whose name, in its turn, reminds us of *Numitor*, the grandfather of the sons of Mars, Romulus and Remus. Besides, we have a *Numisius Martius* or *Numisius Mars*, who belongs to the *gens Numisia*; its name is derived from the same root as *Numitor*, *Numiternus*.

A great part is also played by the gentile gods in the lists of deities, which Varro communicated in his *Antiquitates rerum divinarum*. There we have offered to us a mass of strange names and even stranger interpretations. To take a few examples only, *Edula* and *Potina* have to attend to the feeding of children; the *rura* stand under the protection of the *dea Rusina*, the *colles* under *Collatina*, the *valles* under *Vallonia*. Here again we have actually to recognize gentile deities. *Potina* and *Edula*, who in another passage is called *Edusa*, cannot be separated from *Potinus Potinius Potillus*, *Potisius*, *Puticius* and from *Edusius Etusius*, Etruscan *etsnae*, nor can *Rusina* be separated from *Rusius Rusinius Rusatius*.³⁴ *Collatina* is probably a further formation of the similar root that is present in *Collius*, while, to conclude, *Vallonia* may presumably be set beside *Val(l)ius Valasenius Valonius*.

We need quote no further examples—it will be clear already that the class of gentile deities was somewhat extensive in the Roman cult. *Volcanus*, *Saturnus* and the *Diva Angerona* take their places at once in the same category. What demands special discussion and explanation is a point still to be mentioned.

Edula and *Potina*, *Numisius Martius*, *Rusina* and *Vallonia* were originally and remained objects of private worship. Of *Volcanus*, *Saturnus* and the *Diva Angerona*, too, we must assume that they were originally restricted to the private cult of their *gentes*. Subsequently, at one date or another, they were taken over into the cult of the city. The form of this adoption may in its details have been very varied; guesses on the subject are prospectless. We must, however, distinguish from this adoption the quite distinct process, by which the care of a special state-cult was committed by the state to individual *gentes*, so that they had now

to discharge, by the side of their gentile cult, certain *sacra publica*, in the commission of the state. Thus we meet with the cult of Sol in the hands of the *gens Aurelia*; we also know of the cult of Hercules by the *Potitii* and *Pinarii*, of the cult of Janus at the *tigillum sororium* by the *gens Horatia*.

There is one more factor that comes into play. The period, within which original gentile cults of Etruscan origin were taken over by the state, is a comparatively limited one. Apart from Mercurius, whom we have still to discuss, it is only the earliest calendar that gives such deities as changed from being gentile deities to being deities of the state. But, as the cult of Mercurius goes back into the sixth century,³⁵ this transition, in general, took place at an even earlier date.

For this there is only one possible explanation. If the private cults of the *Volcae*, *Satrii* and **Angerones* were received by the state, that can only have happened at a time, when the Etruscan families as a whole still took up an important position in that state.

We thus catch a glimpse of the social structure of the earliest Roman community. We are accustomed to conceive of it as a community of peasants; there has been similar talk of a Roman 'peasant-religion'. But against this we must emphatically observe that the ruling part of the patrician families certainly does not begin only with the fall of the kingship. It is, like the calendar itself, actually older than the Etruscan dynasty of the *Tarquinius* which, in its turn, represents the arrival in power of just such an Etruscan family.³⁶ We remark, then, at the beginning of the sixth century, a noble or, if the expression be permitted, knightly upper layer of Etruscan origin, standing above the common freemen of the land and city.³⁷ The social structure of the earliest Rome agrees, then, entirely with what we may observe in contemporary Greece. The connexion of a special family with a particular deity, with which is often associated the belief in descent from him, reminds us of the conditions in archaic Greece and its knightly society; the picture that Pindar gives is still the same.

Of this noble Etruscan stratum we can form some conception from other sources too. The name of Rome itself has been traced by W. Schulze to an Etruscan family of the

**ruma*; it must once have played a decisive part in the oldest city-community. Further, M. Weber has already suggested that the patrician families had once been country lords and owners of castles, which were formed into communities.³⁸ This idea has received considerable support from our previous considerations. For, if a series of *montes*, above all, *Palatium*, *Oppius* and *Coelius*, are called after Etruscan families, they must at some time or other have been the residence of one of these noble families. But we also find in ancient Rome such a dwelling of representative and castle-like character which cannot be separated from that aristocratic culture. To the earliest stratum of Roman festivals belongs the sacrifice of a horse on the 15th of October, the so-called *equus October*. After it was slaughtered in honour of the god, the two city-wards, Velia and Subura, the suburbs of the former Palatine and Esquiline community, fought for its severed head. If the former triumphed, the booty was hung up on the Regia, if the latter, on the *turris Mamilia*.³⁹ This latter building, then, lay in the Subura; it got its name from a *gens* of Etruscan name. This *gens* meets us in very early times in the neighbouring Tusculum, where it was related by marriage to the Tarquins; its adoption into the society of Roman citizenship took place, according to the tradition, in the early Republic.⁴⁰ We hear in other cases too (Livy 8, 19, 4; 20, 8) of distinguished families of Latium maintaining a further residence in Rome. Certainly the *gens Mamilia* cannot have stood far in importance behind the royal house. Only on that supposition can we understand how, in the sham fight for the horse's head, the stronghold of the Mamilii was set against the former palace of the King on equal terms, so to say.

Of one of the two branches of the *gens Mamilia* we hear that it was actually called after its tower '*Turrini*'.⁴¹ But the cognomen '*Turrinus*' seems to recur in the *gens Horatia* (CIL. I 1² p. 56) and this shows that it is no isolated phenomenon. We know of such castles of residence for noblemen from almost the whole area of the ancient Mediterranean, from Egypt, from the realm of the Mycenaean and Asia Minor culture; Hannibal himself had *suam turrem* in the neighbourhood of Carthage. In Italy we have to remember

the prehistoric culture of Sardinia, which comes down into our period, and shows a whole series of such places; every landed estate of any size there has its round tower as its fortified centre.⁴²

Even clearer will these conditions become, if we look over to Etruria. We find there a closed class of nobles, whom the Romans call *principes*. They have the leading word at the meetings of the League and, within the several communities, they have a body of armed clients, like the Roman Fabii, who set out with such a band against Veii and, according to the story, were annihilated on the Cremera.⁴³

The Etruscan name, too, of these *principes* is preserved for us—they were called *lucumones*. In the Roman tradition the word usually occurs as proper name. Tarquinius Priscus is said to have been originally so named; a Lucumo comes *ἐκ Σολωνίου πόλεως* to the help of Romulus against Titus Tatius, that is to say, from the region of the later *campus Solonius*, between Ardea, Lavinium and Laurentum.⁴⁴ But apart from this, the *lucumones* also appear as a special class. Romulus obtains aid *a lucumonibus, hoc est a Tuscis* (Serv. *Aen.* 5, 560); the twelve cities had each a *lucumo* at its head and the prophesies of the earth-born god, Tages, are said to have been recorded by the *lucumones*. In all these cases we have to think of a fixed, privileged upper class, of something like the *principes*, in fact. In accordance with this, the Etruscan word *louxumneti*, which appears on the most extensive document of the language, the Mummy-roll of Agram, has probably been rightly interpreted to mean 'in the official residence of the *lucumones*.⁴⁵ It reminds us not only, as has been thought, of the Roman Regia, but still more of the houses of noble *ἐταῖρῆαι* or of the *curiae*, which in Rome were named after special noble families.

One more peculiarity may be mentioned. The appearance of a knightly nobility is indissolubly connected in the whole Mediterranean area with the technique of fighting from the chariot; Max Weber, in particular, has on several occasions pointed to the connexion. The war-chariot demands, to quote his expression,⁴⁶ not only a trained fighter, but also a man of property to equip it. It is significant, that we encounter this means of warfare, not only in the ancient

East and in early Greece, but also in our realm. In ancient Picenum the war-chariot had a very wide extension; remains of something like fifty specimens have been found.⁴⁷ In Etruria we need only quote such a masterpiece as the chariot of Monteleone.⁴⁸ The already mentioned Etruscan grave on the Esquiline has yielded for earliest Rome the remains of a chariot, and probably a war-chariot.⁴⁹ It is easy to conjecture that the races of the 15th of October, at which the right horse of the victorious team was offered to Mars, were originally races of war-chariots.

Let us sum up our conclusions. It became plain to us earlier in our discussion, that, simply on linguistic grounds, the earliest divine order in Rome presented no single picture; Etruscan and native names can be plainly distinguished. To this division corresponds a similar distinction in origin between the gods themselves, and, more than that, we have been able to follow it up into the detailed arrangements of the earliest community.

3. THE RECEPTION OF THE GREEK DEITIES

There remains for discussion a class, the appearance of which in the earliest order is of special importance,—we mean, that of the Greek deities. How did they reach Rome?

First of all, we can give a negative answer to one question. In no single case can it be shown that immediate contact took place between Rome and Greece or a Greek colony. It was by foreign intermediary, then, that the figures of the Greek world of gods reached Rome. The nature of this mediation leads us to the central problem of ancient Italian culture.

As the immediate starting-point, from which the shapes of the Greek world of gods found admittance to Rome, we may mention two neighbouring districts; ⁵⁰ first, Oscan Campania, important because of its colonization by Greeks, especially, because of the oldest settlement, Cumae; secondly, Southern Etruria. A decision between the two in detail is often difficult to make.

In the case of Liber we have to think first of Campania. Beside him appears a female deity, Libera; as he himself

seems to have a model in Dionysos *Ἐλευθερος*, the former existence of a goddess *Ἐλευθέρα* might be deduced from the chief place of worship, *Ἐλευθερονί*. This view, which has been vigorously contested in some quarters, has, some years since, received not inconsiderable support from the discovery of a Venetian goddess *louzera*.⁵¹

Even more difficult is the question in the case of Ceres. A number of indications point to Campania, above all, the early appearance of the goddess among the Oscans and Sabellians. A whole series of cults of a divine 'mother' and 'daughter', corresponding in their nature to Demeter and Kore, extends from Sicily, Paestum and Samnium right up into central Italy; the connexion with the Greek south is in this way palpable.⁵² But we must also mention the South Etruscan Falerii, where the name of Ceres appears as early as the sixth century in the inscription of the so-called 'Ceres vase'. The Italian designation of Demeter would be explicable, not only by mediation through the Oscans, but also from the existence of such a city as Falerii demonstrably was, with a strong substratum closely akin to the Latins.⁵³

With Volcanus the case is quite clear. The Etruscan name shows from whence Rome received Hephaistos. In cult, too, we find at every step contacts with Etruria. Most remarkable is the fact, that Volcanus in Rome appears also as god of lightning, for which on the Greek side there are no immediate parallels. The Etruscan discipline, on the other hand, knows him as god of the heavenly fire; as such he takes rank immediately after Jupiter. In this point, then, again is the Etruscan origin of Volcanus proved; Hephaistos, at its adoption into the Etruscan cult, found his place in the doctrine of lightning and came in this form to Rome.

Conditions in Rome, then, show that other peoples preceded Rome in their reception of Greek cults. Not only could we deduce this fact from the phenomena, which we have encountered in Rome; we can also observe it immediately in its occurrence.

At this point, the history of Etruscan art begins to offer us a support. We realize that as early as 600 the world of Greek gods and heroes is firmly established there. We may

quote from the early sixth century the war-chariot of Monteleone and the bronze reliefs of Castello S. Mariano near Perugia. To the turn of the seventh and sixth centuries we are led by the plastic works from the cemetery of Vulci.⁵⁴ In the course of the seventh century the finds of vases show, that Greek and, in particular, Etruscan artisans worked in Etruria. We owe this knowledge to an authority of the first order, A. Blakeway; he has referred, in the same connexion, to the tradition, according to which Demaratus, a member of the house of the Bacchiadae of Corinth, the supposed father of the elder Tarquin, brought Greek artisans, among them a potter, to Tarquinii.⁵⁵

But we have not yet reached the upper limit. The representation of the *πόρνια θεῶν* on a gold ornament from the Tomba Regolini-Galassi near Caere or on the finds in other graves such as the Tomba di Petriera of Vetulonia, the so-called Bokchoris grave of Tarquinii, and, in Latium itself, the already mentioned Tomba Bernardini of Praeneste, go back into the early seventh century. The frequent occurrence of this form of representation must show that what we have here is not, as has been supposed, the mere adoption of an ornamental type, but that the conception of the 'mistress of the wild' as such had already penetrated into the realm of Etruria.⁵⁶ A mythological scene (the departure of Amphiaras for the war) has been recognized by L. Curtius⁵⁷ on a bronze relief of Montecalvario.

As a further example Populonia in North Etruria may serve us.⁵⁸ The Etruscan name of the city (*pupluna*, *pufluna*, *fufluna*) is derived from the god *fufluns*, who is none other than Dionysos. *Fufluns* stands beside the other name *paxies* (*Βάχιος*), just as *turms*, as Etruscan designation of Hermes, stands beside the grecizing form *hrm*.⁵⁹ As a matter of fact, even the name *Fufluns* seems to go back to a Greek original; it has been brought into connexion with the *Βύβλιος οἶκος* of the isle of Naxos.⁶⁰ Liber, then, finds his parallel on the Etruscan side, not only in his character, but also in the age of his cult. In Populonia, at least, the worship of the god, from whom the city got its name, must reach back to its beginnings.

The date of the Etruscan settlement seems here to go back

further than was formerly assumed. The most ancient traces are nowadays placed in the period from 1000-950.⁶¹ But, even if this result should be confirmed,⁶² it does not imply an actual city. Indeed, we are expressly told that Populonia was later than the rest of the Etruscan cities. It certainly only attained importance in the sixth century, when it began to outdo the maritime fame of the neighbouring Vetulonia. Only a little earlier than this shall we be able to place the foundation of a civic settlement, perhaps in the period which is marked by the appearance of the chamber-graves in the cemetery. We thus reach the beginnings of the seventh century: it is in that age that the city will have received its later name.

Shortly after 700, then, we find Dionysos worshipped in an Italian city. The period is rather earlier than the reception of Dionysos in Rome, but still offers an important confirmation of our result. Yet another Greek god meets us in Populonia, who also appears within the oldest Roman circle, the god Hephaistos. In Populonia, however, he is not named after the *gens Volca* or *velxa*, but bears the name *setlans* after another Etruscan family, which is to be read perhaps as **setla* and belongs to an extensive group of names (*Setilius*, *Sedilius*, *Setullius* *Setuleius* *Sedulatus*).

Hephaistos, *setlans*, too, must have been very old in Populonia. His worship stands in close relation to the highly developed local working of the iron-ore, which was obtained from the neighbouring Elba. What is even more important, the close connexion with *Dionysos-fufluns* is not to be mistaken.

Fufluns, as we have seen, probably got his name from the isle of Naxos. That implies that the cult too comes from the same island; as confirmation of this, we note the fact, that, in the local saga of Dionysos, the Tyrrhenians, the ancestors of the Etruscans in Asia Minor, appear; they had subdued the neighbouring Lemnos and had made it their base for their piracies. We come, then, on traces of ancient connexions between the god of Naxos and a people, which must on general grounds be considered as possibly kin to or even identical with the Etruscans. We have further evidence for the connexion of North Etruria with Lemnos ⁶³

and need not, therefore, be surprised at the early reception of Dionysos in Populonia. Now we know that on that island another god was associated with Dionysos, Hephaistos.⁶⁴ On the Tyrrhenian Lemnos then, he had a primitive seat; he was thought of as working at his smithy at Mosychlos. If we now bear in mind that Populonia had an old and important cult of *śēblans*, the conclusion is obvious that at the foundation of the city, together with the Naxian Dionysos, the associated Hephaistos was adopted. In that case, this will be a second case of a Greek god having his seat in an Etruscan city at the beginning of the seventh century.

Summing up, we may say that the archaeological finds show as clearly as we could wish, that the Etruscans preceded Rome and Latium in their reception of the world of Greek gods. Similarly, a close study of the various Greek cults, that have found their place within the oldest religious order in Rome, confirms our belief that in no case can we recognize an immediate contact between Rome and the Greek world, but that other peoples of Italy always played the part of intermediaries. The fact may at first strike us as strange, but it finds its parallels in more than one direction.

The process that takes place on the grand scale in Rome is repeated on a smaller scale in the neighbouring city of Southern Etruria, Falerii. There, too, we have an Italian stratum that was overlaid and penetrated by strong Etruscan influences. Accordingly, there appear there, as we shall see in a later chapter, beside Latin deities Greek deities too, which in part at least were adopted by the Faliscans under the influence of Etruria. But we also meet with the mediation of a second people, the Illyrians of Italy. Their settlements not only included Apulia and the eastern valley of the Po, but also extended right along the shores of the Adriatic; at certain spots, particularly in Umbria and the land of the Paeligni,⁶⁵ they even set foot in the interior of the land. In Iguvium the 'oak-god' Mars (*Grabovius*) was communicated by them to the native Umbrians,⁶⁶ and, as we might expect, they also appeared as the intermediaries for Greek cults and sagas.⁶⁷ That the figure of Aeneas reached Rome and Italy through the mediation of the Illyrians has been proved by the most recent treatment of the subject.⁶⁸

Similarly, Poseidon seems to have been worshipped in Falerii under his Illyrian name, Messapus.⁶⁹

A further parallel, which may be drawn, lies in the earliest stratum of words borrowed from the Greek, which we find in Latin. They too, as may be established by unmistakable evidences, were taken over through the intermediary of other peoples. These are once again the same peoples that we have already encountered, the Oscans and Sabellians, and, above all, the Etruscans. Through the mediation of Etruria, *γνώμα* was taken over as *gruma*, *σκαρά* as *scaena*, Ganymedes as *Catamitus*, Acheron as *Acheruns*, perhaps also Polydeukes as *Pollux* (Etruscan *puluke*), to mention only a few examples. On the other hand, the formation of the stem of *Aias*, *Aiacis* in face of *Αἴας*, *Αἰάντος* points to the mediation of the Oscans, the sound of *rosa* in face of *ῥόδέα* to that of the Sabines.

Beside the Oscans and the Etruscans we have realized the importance in Falerii of the Italian Illyrians. Here too a linguistic parallel may be adduced. The Roman form of the name, *Ulixes*, shows that the figure of Odysseus cannot have first reached Latium through the Ionian epic. As intermediaries, we have rather, on the grounds of the linguistic form, to think probably of the Messapians of South Italy, certainly of Illyrian tribes, such as were surely settled in the immediate neighbourhood of Odysseus's home.⁷⁰

The history of language and the history of religion, then, yield one and the same picture. In both cases we see an early and considerable influence exercised by Greece on early Rome, but in both cases the contact is not an immediate one. The Greek element is willingly accepted, but there is no trace of any attempt to press up to its source.

The peculiarity of these circumstances will stand out more clearly, if we bring the later period into comparison with them.⁷¹ That wave of Greek culture, so strong and so fraught with destiny for the future, which sets in with the second half of the third century, is characterized by the consciousness that the adoption of Greek civilization meant a fundamental, transforming influence on the whole man. In this time falls the coining of the conception of *humanitas* to describe the essence of this culture. At the same time arises the demand

that every one who aims at it must go to the sources, that is to say, must experience the works of the Greeks by knowledge of the language, by direct contemplation. This demand, which has ever since then remained valid, stands in sharp contrast to what we have observed for our period. The consciousness of Greek *παιδεία* as an original form of culture is not to be found in it.

With this negative characterization, however, the way is already indicated by which we can arrive at a solution of our problem. The reception of the Greek world in our age is no conscious spiritual act, but a natural product of a historical process. It is bound to strike us, that just those peoples come into question as intermediaries for Rome, who, like the Oscans, lived in the immediate neighbourhood of Magna Graecia, or who, like the Etruscans, had from of old, perhaps already in their home in Asia Minor, stood in close touch with Greece. It was just a question of adopting and handing on, as one takes over all manner of things from a neighbour with whom one stands in contact. Even if, over and above this, the grandeur of Greek civilization played a rôle that we must not underestimate, that implies only a difference in degree, not in principle. Jews, Indians, Arabs and Syrians, at a later time, received the same culture in the same way—again in the course of a natural, historical process, without deliberate appropriation or deeper spiritual penetration.

Chapter IV

RELIGION OF ROME AND EARLY ITALY

IF it is true that Rome received her earliest Greek deities from Etruria and the Oscans of Campania, this fact implies that the various parts of the peninsula already stood in relatively close connexion with one another. We get the impression that the single, racially distinct cultures did not merely live in separate isolation, but that, beyond this, some bond of union had already begun to embrace them. We should have, in that case, to speak not only of the various cultures of Italy, but also of a single early Italian culture. Nor could this conception be restricted to the 'Italian' peoples, in the strict sense; from the first, Greek and Etruscan elements appeared within it.

We have come back, then, to the problem from which we set out at the beginning of our enquiry—the relation of the religion, indeed of the culture of early Rome in general, to that of early Italy. But there is this difference; we are now in a position to grasp the problem more distinctly and, in part at least, to answer it.

We have already seen, that the conception of a religion of primitive Italy, or even of single primitive Italian deities, could not stand before a closer examination. A community of religious ideas among the peoples of Italy is only present from the moment when the Umbro-Sabellian people migrated into Italy. But the immigration was not restricted to this one stream. At about the same time, that is to say, about the tenth century B.C., the Illyrian peoples of Italy took up their abode there; we have already succeeded in observing how they took part in the formation of linguistic factors that are common Italian property. At about the same time appear the Etruscans and then, at about 800 B.C., the Greeks on the peninsula. And here we reach an import-

ant result. As soon as the first signs of a general Italian development appear, so soon must we reckon, in principle at least, with the possibility of contacts having been established with the Greek world and with the Etruscans.

How early the relations between Italians and Greeks extend, W. Schulze has tried to demonstrate from a Greek word, *λίττα*, which was taken over by an Italian tribe.¹ To reach a 'national' Italian culture, free from all Greek elements, seems, then, to be a prospectless endeavour. Rather we may say that the Greek element does not merely appear very early in Italy, but that it may be marked as one of the elements that went to constitute Italian culture. 'Italian' and 'Greek', then, are not mutually exclusive conceptions, in the sense in which we use them to-day. At the very beginning of Italian history is revealed a peculiarity which continues to be noticeable along the later course of development; the apparently foreign world of Greece has the power to awaken in the people, by which it is received, the slumbering national forces, and liberate them for the formation of a culture, which takes its form from the inter-penetration of native and adopted (i.e. Greek) elements.

How little Greek borrowings were regarded as essentially opposite to the native element, our previous investigations may already avail to show. We shall not be mistaken if we assume that the Greek deities, who came to the Romans through Oscan or Etruscan mediation, appeared to them at first as purely Italian. Definitely in favour of this view is the fact that they all without exception bear Italian names and actually retained them. They were not felt to be foreign any more than any other deities, who came to Rome at the same time or later. To experience the Greek element as specifically distinct in origin or meaning lay far from men's thoughts.

One further example may help us to realize this existence of two spheres within and beside one another. It may to-day rank as certain, that one class of dramatic performance was native in Italy, the *fabula Atellana*.² Its origin is to be sought in Etruria and in the sphere of religion; we have the right, then, to bring it into our discussion. Its oldest

form meets us on Etruscan grave-paintings of the sixth century ; from the motherland it reached the Oscans through the Etruscan conquest of Campania and there developed to a splendid prime. People in Rome were still conscious, as the name *ludi Osci* shows, of having derived this type of drama from that quarter.

It has long since been observed, that the popular play of Grecian South Italy, the Phlyaces, did not escape contact with the Atellan drama. Wilamowitz³ has tried to prove definite Italian influence from the fact that these Phlyaces developed into veritable farce. It was only the dash of Italian *acetum* that made the play of Southern Italy a form distinct from its Laconian originals, the *δεικνύμεναι*.⁴ In the comedy of Epicharmus in the Sicilian Megara, again, Wilamowitz has wished to recognize the expression of a specifically Italian spirit.⁵

On the other hand, the Italian play must have owed much to the Greek. I have already called attention to one special point ; the metre that is still characteristic of the Atellan, when it attained literary form, the *versus quadratus*, seems to come from the comedy of South Italy or of Sicily.⁶ Even more important is a second point. Stage play and dramatic poetry are by no means necessarily related. Just as dramatic poetry can be effective without treading the boards, so too can the boards be the scene of quite undramatic, if lively, performances ; dancing, singing and mimicry as such, when displayed there, will never miss their effect. Whether the Atellans were originally anything more than this, is rendered at least doubtful by the Etruscan grave-paintings. Livy, again, in a well-known passage, (F 7, 2, 4) tells us how the Etruscan *ludiones*, to quote his own words, *sine carmine ullo, sine imitandorum carminum actu . . . ad tibicinis modos saltantes haud indecoros motus more Tusco dabant*. Here Greek influence must have set in ; it certainly gave the Atellan, for the first time, a dramatic character or, at least, the beginnings of one.

We have already remarked that the origin of the Atellan farce is to be sought in cult ; we must now go further into the point. As a starting-point the Etruscan funeral-plays are obvious. The demon of death, Phersu, seems to have

appeared as a (comic ?) figure in the play itself, reminding us of the fact that in a later Atellan of Novius the goddess of the dead, Mania, the mother of the Lares, appeared in a comic rôle.⁷ The connexion of the coarse and loose, often obscene, play with the worship of the dead is remarkably significant. We come upon a circle of ideas, on which H. Usener has touched in a short observation on 'Laughing and Weeping'.⁸ The dissoluteness of the play, the element of living laughter, stands as a force contrasted with the lamentation over the dead. For jest and ridicule, just like laughing aloud, are alien to the world of the *umbræ silentes*, the *taciti manes*.

In Athens, as the vase-paintings show, there were, at least as early as the sixth century, and probably much earlier, choruses in disguise, like those of comedy later, especially of birds and knights. We shall have to think of them as appearing at the festivals of Dionysos ἐν Ἀθῆναις or at the κατ' ἀγροὺς Διονύσια; in them the phallus, both in costume and gesture, played a large rôle. Primitive stages of development are marked by the ἰθύφαλλοι and the φαλλοφόροι on Delos, of which Semos tells us (*Athen.* 622 B f.). In Italy they have their counterpart in the cult of Liber. We know of the solemn procession of the Dionysiac phallus at Lanuvium; to the coarse chatter, which accompanied the appearance of the choirs of Dionysos, correspond here the *verba flagitiosissima*, which rang out in the solemn march of the symbol at Lanuvium.⁹

The festivals of Dionysos fall in the spring, when the god leads up from the earth together with the flowers of the field the swarms of souls. The immediate connexion of a gross, lascivious play with a festival, which thus belonged also to the dead, is met with in the country Liberalia, as described by Vergil (*Georg.* 2, 386 f.). We hear there of loose Dionysiac behaviour, with dancing, singing, and primitive mummary; beside it stands the hanging up of masks (*oscilla*) in honour of the god. We may count it as certain, that we have here to do with a very ancient custom, connected from the first with the cult of Dionysos, that has its counterpart also on the Greek side.¹⁰ Through the mask the god was here honoured as lord of the swarming souls. Once

again a comic and dissolute play stands immediately beside the cult of the dead.

A further reflection now forces itself upon us. Just like the hanging up of the masks and the worship of the god in them, the play itself may have belonged to the earliest cult of Liber-Dionysos in Italy. The country Liberalia will in that case have preserved an ancient peculiarity, which in the city-festival had meanwhile been lost.

That this is indeed the case is suggested by the fact that we have traces of similar festivals and games from very early times. On one of the walls of the Tomba della caccia e della pesca in Tarquinii we see the picture of such a country festival with dancing, singing and drinking. More important, as it points directly to the sphere of Dionysos, is the relief on a sarcophagus from Chiusi; on it we recognize men disguised as satyrs, decked out in masks and other gear.¹¹ Both pictures probably belong to the sixth century and therefore attest plays comparable to the Liberalia as early as that date. In any case we shall prefer to suppose that such a primitive play as Vergil describes was taken over at a time, when the suggestions of an artistic development in the direction of comedy were not yet present even in Greece itself.

Finally, there is one more point to be mentioned. The well-known fragment of Naevius (fr. 118 Ribb.): *libera lingua loquemur ludis Liberalibus* has up to now been referred to the Greek *Διούσια*.¹² But could we not simply apply it to the Liberalia? In that case we could assume in Rome itself similar behaviour to that in the country and the whole would fit into one single picture.

One further feature that is common to Greek and Italian conceptions remains to be mentioned—the appearance of the earth-mother in the form of a horse. We know it from Greek religion, but we have also met it in the forms in which Demeter appears in Rome, in the case of Ceres and Tellus.¹³ In the story of Camilla the fact still appears that she herself must once have been the daughter of Metabus and a wife in the form of a mare. Just as, then, we cannot fail to recognize Poseidon in her father, we cannot fail to recognize in her mother the earth-mother in horse-form.¹⁴ Finally,

in the case of Tellus, the connexion with the sacred horse of Mars, the *equus October*, is most worthy of note; ¹⁵ here Greek and native conceptions appear in immediate association.

In connexion with the games that we have already discussed we should mention that the Roman *satura* seems to have its starting-point in the cult of Ceres.¹⁶ This agrees with the connexion of the beginnings of a literary form, the *Iambos*, with Demeter. In Rome, as in Athens, the enjoyment and offering of the sacred foods (in one case, the *κρυκεών*, in the other, the *satura*) were associated with loose conduct, merrymaking and mockery in the closest possible way. And, in this relation, all were contrasted with a time of abstinence and sorrow.

Finally, it has become clear, since the demonstration of G. Pasquali,¹⁷ that the Saturnian metre, in the last resort, goes back to a combination of two Greek cola. While, on the one hand, then, the adoption of a foreign metre is unmistakable at a very early date,¹⁸ that combination and its further formal development was the work of Roman transformation. Through it, the original short lyrical lines (which still appear as such in the song of the Arval Brothers ¹⁹) were made into a metre for recitative and, further, into the metre of the earliest Roman epic.

Here again, from the very outset, Italian and Greek elements have interpenetrated. Not less clearly are such likenesses to be seen in the realm of Etruria and Rome. We are readily disposed to think of Rome and Latium as in early times exclusively the receivers, of Etruria as the giver. This is certainly largely true. But we must realize that in Etruria and above all, in the south of that land, a strong Italian substratum was present. An Italian people, akin to the Latin, had once held those districts; in Falerii, in the south-east of Etruria, the Italo-Faliscan under-layer could never be quite suppressed by its Etruscan lords. The penetration of the earlier Italian population by the Etruscan immigrants only took place very slowly. In the cemeteries we see how very gradually, beside the cremation-graves of the Villanova people, the 'fossa-' and chamber-graves of the new masters appear; often the two groups lie indiscriminately beside one another. The relatively rapid decline

of Etruscan individuality after the Roman conquest was probably due largely to the fact, that there was still present in Etruria the substratum of an earlier population, akin to the Romans.

On the other hand we may expect to find early influences of Latium on Etruria. Juno was taken over there as *uni*, Janus as *ani*, Mars became *maris*, Silvanus *selvans*. Language, as often, offers the clearest picture. Etruscan *nefts* goes back to Latin *nepos*, *-otis*, Etruscan *cupe* must be connected with Latin *cupa*, Greek *κύπη*; the Etruscan word is the earliest evidence for the vulgar Latin *cuppus*, formed as a stem in *-o*, which is demanded by the Italian *coppo*.²⁰ A surviving Etruscan gloss, *laena*, the name of an article of clothing, was already associated in ancient times with Latin *lana* (Varro, *de l. l.* 5, 183). This is undoubtedly a case of a Latin word borrowed by Etruscan. The change from *a* > *ae* is to be judged as in *γαλήνη*, Doric *γαλάνα* > Etruscan *calaina* or as in *σκηνή*, Doric *σκανά* > Latin *scaena*, which came to Rome through Etruscan mediation. The list might be extended in various directions. As Etruscan name of October we have given us *wosfer*. The suffix *-fer* reminds us of the Latin *-ber*, which meets us in the Latin name of the month, as also in September, November and December. Where the starting-point here is to be sought is not yet clear. There is no doubt, however, about the conditions in the case of the name of the *mensis Junius*.

That it goes back to the goddess Juno has never been questioned. But the formation of the stem causes difficulties. Why was not the month called *Junonius*?²¹ We have been reminded that from the name of Poseidon we get not only derived forms like *Ποσειδέωνιος*, *Ποσειδώνιος*, *Ποσειδανία*, but also *Ποσιδεος*, *Ποσειδάιος*, *Ποτειδαία*. The *-n-* suffix in adjectival formations will have been occasionally suppressed.²² But we know to-day that this suffix is secondary in the name of the god. The old form was *Ποτιδάς*²³ and from it and parallel forms the adjectives without *-n* are derived. We must seek our explanation, then, along another path.

The recent attempt to derive *Junius* from an Oscan form of the name of the goddess, **Juna*,²⁴ contradicts all that we certainly know of the origin and earliest distribution of the

cult; Latium alone can come into question as its earliest home. Everything becomes intelligible, if we once more set out from Etruscan. Juno in Etruria is called *uni*, with loss of the initial, as in Etruscan *ani*, 'Janus'. From (i)*uni* *Junius* is a regular derivation. In Etruscan itself we know a gentile name *uni* (= **unie*), genitive *unial*. This is the more remarkable, because, as we have already said, Juno has her home south of the Tiber; only from there did her cult reach Etruria, albeit in very early times. The earliest Roman calendar, then, with its *mensis Junius*, presumes the existence of an Etruscan goddess, *uni*, beside the Latin Juno. The name of the month itself perhaps comes from South Etruria and passed from there to Rome. That *Aclus* is in other places recorded as the Etruscan name of June is no serious objection; the month may have had different names in different parts of Etruria.

We can advance yet one step further. The process of give and take both on the side of Rome and on that of Etruria was bound finally to lead to a close cultural community between them. On the evidence of finds we can already say that from the beginning of the seventh century an increasingly marked cultural uniformity was realized in Southern Etruria and Latium. From about the sixth century the two districts actually form a single closed circle of culture. Here again language has its corresponding picture to give us. One may think of the Italian system of names, which the two peoples virtually created in alliance with one another.

Beside this we may place a parallel from the sphere of divine names. We find the souls of the dead described in Rome as the (*di*) *manes*, that is to say, as the 'good'.²⁵ An adjective *manus* (with the same meaning) and a series of other formations are also preserved—for example, the goddess, *Mania*, the mother of the Lares; neither she nor *Genita Mana* nor the *Mana*, who is quoted by Martian, Capella 2, 164, among the deities of the underworld, can deny their connexion with the Manes. In Oscan the Manes are denoted by the stem **māto-* (*maatūis kerriūis*, Planta 200; Conway 175). We have, then, a root **mā-*, which is extended by various suffixes (*-no-* and *-to-*). In Etruscan the same root occurs, again to denote the deities of death and the

underworld. Here belongs the god, *Mantus*, from whom the city of *Mantua* got its name, as well as a clan that is developed from the same root, *Manturna*, *Mantuona*, Etruscan *mantrns*. Here the root **mā-* is lengthened by an *-nt-* suffix, as often in Etruscan. Whether we have here a hybrid between an Italian root and an Etruscan suffix or whether this root **mā-* represents one of those original points in common between Etruscan and an Indo-Germanic language, which are often to be observed, cannot at the moment be decided. We must confine ourselves to establishing the fact that the designation of the deities of death by means of a root **mā-*, 'good', is a peculiarity shared by Latin with Oscan and Etruscan.

Our last remark has brought us from the sphere of linguistics to that of religious conceptions. The characterization of these deities as the 'good', then, is a distinctive mark of Italian religion also. We have now reached the decisive point. It cannot, of course be the aim of a short sketch like the present to answer the question of community of religious conception in earliest Italy in general; but we may illustrate by a few examples the importance and fruitfulness of such a form of questioning.

We begin with a god, of whom it has long been realized that he represents 'the picture of a special side of Jupiter'—the god *Dius Fidius*, or, to give him his full Roman name, *Semo Sancus Dius Fidius*. He does not appear in the earliest calendar, but, for all that, he must be an ancient deity, as his appearance among the Umbrians proves. The ritual of Iguvium names a **Fisos* or **Fisovios Sancios*, in whose name we recognize without difficulty the two component parts of *Fidius* and *Sancus*. The close connexion with Jupiter, too, finds its confirmation here, for, by him, we find a *Jupater Sancios*. If the Roman god appears in particular as a god of oaths, we find again the counterpart here. The wheel-shaped disks, which were preserved in the temple of *Dius Fidius* and counted as symbols of alliance, the *orbes aenei*, are also employed in the Umbrian cult (Umbrian *urfeta* = *orbita*).

Among the Oscans the same god seems to occur. For in the Oscan *fistais pumperiais*, *fisiais eiduis* of the Capuan

inscriptions lurks the name of our god, as Bücheler has seen.²⁶ There is, indeed, a linguistic difficulty in the way of this view, which must be considered again in the case of the identification of the Umbrian **Fisos* or **Fisovios Sancios* that we have championed. Oscan *fiisio-*, that is to say **Fisio-*, cannot be equated with *fides*, *Fidius*, and *fidere* (from **feidere*).²⁷ Yet it has probably been right to insist that, in view of the correspondence in fact, some escape from the linguistic difficulties must be found,²⁸ the more so as these agreements in essence can be established not only between Roman and Umbrian cult, but also on the Oscan side.

It is hard to decide what is meant by *fiisiais pūmperiais*; all the acumen spent on it has hitherto yielded no certain result. Better is the case of the *fisiais eiduis*, especially as they are supported by the *eidūis mamertiais* which appear beside them. It can only be the Ides that are meant—the Ides of **Fisos-Fidius* and the Ides of *Mamers*, that is to say, of the Oscan Mars.²⁹ In the case of Mars we must bear in mind, that of the two festivals of Mars registered in the Roman calendar, the 14th of March and the 15th of October, the first falls one day before the Ides, the second on the Ides themselves. For *Dius Fidius*, too, a connexion can be found.

Speaking of the names of the Ides, Varro writes: *idus ab eo, quod Tusci itus vel potius quod Sabini idus dicunt* (*de l. l.* 6, 28). Macrobius expresses himself at greater length; *iduum . . . nomen a Tuscis, apud quos is dies itus vocatur, sumptum est. Item autem illi interpretantur Jovis fiduciam. Nam cum Jovem accipiamus lucis auctorem, unde et Lucetium Salii in carminibus canunt, et Cretenses Ατα την ημεραν vocant*,³⁰ *ipsi quoque Romani Diespitrem appellant, ut diei patrem. Iure hic dies Jovis fiducia vocatur, cuius lux non finitur cum solis occasu, sed splendorem diei et noctem continuat inlustrante luna, quod semper in plenilunio, id est medio mense, fieri solet* (*Sat.* 1, 15, 14 f.).

What conclusions do we draw from this?—That the Ides were sacred to Jupiter we know from other sources as well. We have to do with a very ancient conception; it already appears in the calendar. If the days of the full moon belonged to the sky-god, that implies that the shining of the

moon by night stood in some relation or other to him. He was not only the god of the sky by day and of daylight, but god of the heavenly light in general.³¹ That the root **div-*, as it appears in *Jupiter Diespiter*, *dium* &c., is connected in Latin not only with the day, but also with the stars of the night has been deduced from the name of the goddess, Diana (**Diviana*) whom we have still to discuss, whose connexion with the moon stands beyond question. That, further, the goddess, to whom the Arval Brethren offer their sacrifices, the Dea Dia (*Dia* from **Diviā*) was a moon-goddess, we have, as we hope, proved in another work.³² We find the same meaning in Etruscan, where we can quote the name of the moon-goddess *Tiv*, who has her parallels also in the languages of Asia Minor.³³ In this circle the name of Dius (**Divius*) Fidius belongs. We have already referred to his connexion with Jupiter; Dia and Diana are related to him as feminine formations,³⁴ and we may, therefore, conjecture, that in his case, too, the relation to the light of night will not be missing. The connexion can be drawn even closer; just as the oath by Dius Fidius is taken under the open sky, so too does the Master of the Arval Brethren, when he announces the festival of the Dea Dia to the brotherhood between the Nones and Ides of January, perform the rite *sub divo*.³⁵ The Oscan evidence fits in perfectly; it is the coping-stone of our argument. If special ides were dedicated to **Fisios*, there lay in his nature some relation to the light of the moon. In that case he can hardly have been any other than the Roman Dius Fidius.

From this a conclusion results. The name of the *ides* has hitherto been regarded as inexplicable on the linguistic side. The derivation from Etruscan and the interpretation as *Jovis fiducia* that is inseparable from it has again and again been called in question. But now we can no longer disguise from ourselves how excellently this interpretation fits in with our previous line of thought. A linguistic explanation from Etruscan can, it is true, even now not be given. But if the Ides are brought into connexion with the god of loyalty and oaths, **Fisos* or *Fidius*, who himself represents a special invocation of Jupiter, that indicates with absolute certainty that the explanation as *Jovis fiducia* hits the mark.

The relation of Jupiter to the day of the full moon on the Ides, might, if we set out from its common appearance among the Romans and Oscans, have raised a claim to rank as primitive Italian. Yet this very case must show how premature such a conclusion would be. Not only do the Ides, as we are expressly informed, bear an Etruscan name, but the traditional explanation of the name on the ground of Etruscan as *Jovis fiducia* may now rank as certain. However conservatively we estimate these facts, we cannot escape the conclusion that the conception in question was from the first proper not only to the Italians in the narrower sense, but also to the Etruscans. As the attempt to assign priority to either of the two groups is prospectless, we shall for the time being have to assume that the conception was developed by both in common.

After the Ides and their connexion with Jupiter we may name yet another example which again proves the extension of a religious conception over wide areas of Italy. With it we are again brought into the circle of the sky-god.

In Iguvium in Umbria there was a triad of gods, which (beside another, distinguished by the epithet Grabovius) all bore their relation to Jupiter in their name; *Trebos Jovios*, *Tefros Jovios* and *Fisos Sancios*.³⁶ The third of this triad we have already treated in passing; it is the first in this circle that will now occupy us.

To explain the name *Trebos*, we have been referred to Oscan *trībūm*, accusative, 'domum', *trībarakkiuf*, 'aedificium', *trībarakavum*, 'aedificare', Latin *trabs*, 'beam'.³⁷ It has been supposed that the name of the god meant simply 'house'.³⁸ But this would lack any real analogy and the reference to the fact that other abstract ideas are to be found in the Italian religions has little force.³⁹ Further, it seems in the highest degree unlikely, that a god like *Trebos* was actually named 'house' as an abstract term—at least if we compare it with such acknowledged abstractions as *Fides*, *Mens*, *Febris*, *Salus*, or the analogies in Greek religion.⁴⁰ Students of religion have rather been inclined to recognize in the belief in a supposed god, Janus, 'door', Lares, 'house-plot', Vesta, 'hearth', an emphasizing of the actual, the immediately experienced, the concrete.⁴¹

Another possibility has been proposed by A. v. Blumenthal.⁴² He reminds us how primitive German **ansu*, 'god', 'Ase', might be explained etymologically as a sacred pillar,⁴³ and that we can now place beside it Venetic **ahsu*, 'image of wood'.⁴⁴ Now with Trebos is obviously connected Latin *trabs*, 'beam', just like the primitive kindred forms in Old Bulgarian, *trēba*, 'image', and *trēbznikja* 'shrine',⁴⁵ and this association is recommended on grounds of fact, in so far as the possibility of connexion with Jupiter now for the first opens up. St. Augustine, *de. civ. dei* 7, 11, quotes from Varro a Roman Jupiter Tigillus; in this name, parallel to the Umbrian *Trebos Jovios*, the sky-god is directly designated as 'pillar' or 'beam'. We may also think of the *tigillum sororium*, to which sacrifice was made in Rome on the 1st of October.⁴⁶ As Jupiter is himself the beam, worship is paid in the second place to the beam itself; *tigillo sororio ad compitum Acili* is the note in the Fasti of the Arval Brethren on the day just mentioned.

Here once again the Roman conception takes its place within the circle of the Italian; beside the Umbrian ritual the Venetian people, too, seems to offer an analogy. A further question would be, what have we to conceive under the form of the 'beam' or 'pillar' as god, and, in particular, as Jupiter? Quickest with their explanation will probably be those who are always ready to divine a prehistoric cult of fetishes. On the other hand, Varro's interpretation of Jupiter Tigillus, *quod tanquam tigillus mundum continet ac sustinet*, must not be entirely disregarded. The Germanic Irmin column, which at once suggests itself for comparison, the ancient Cretan cult of pillars and columns, and all the parallels that may be adduced from ancient Sardinia⁴⁷—these should represent the sphere in which we might hopefully seek the explanation. But nothing short of an exhaustive inquiry, such as is out of the question here, could lead to any result.

Finally, we may quote a third and last case to illustrate the importance of the world of conceptions held in common throughout primitive Italy. Only, in this case, beside the common element, the element of division comes into greater prominence—the special form under which a divine being

is conceived by individual peoples and fitted into the sum of their picture of the world.

One of the characteristic deities of Rome is the Genius. There is no doubt, that in Etruria there existed an entirely comparable conception; the agreements in detail can easily be indicated.⁴⁸ But beside these agreements appear just as obvious and as fundamental differences. A vigorous emphasis on the physical, on sex and blood-connexion, a special position of woman within the order of society, a specifically feminine view of the world in Etruria, is answered in Rome by a not less decided aversion to such ideas. The Roman conception of Genius has a pronounced male orientation.

This has all been set out with sufficient force at an earlier point.⁴⁹ Here we would only call attention to one detail. It is characteristic of the Etruscan conception, that the Genius is not only represented as phallus, but that it also appears as a grave-monument. For this world procreation and death are indissolubly connected. In the bosom of earth, where the dead finds his place of rest, new life is conceived; from the nature of death and the dead it draws its force. Just as Etruria takes up a position of contrast to Rome with its father-right through its special position of woman, so to the primacy of woman over man corresponds the devotion, inseparable from it, to the powers of the earth in their two aspects—lords of birth and death.

From Etruria our gaze involuntarily wanders to that other age, which was similarly attached to the earth, to the pre-Homeric world. It seems to-day to be in process of being revealed to us that the Etruscan conception of Genius had its parallels there.⁵⁰ The pre-Homeric world of gods had its influence on Rome as well as on Etruria. But in Rome it never came to an exclusive primacy of the earth-deities, even if an important place is duly assigned to them; still less could a primacy of woman as against the male principle be carried through. With this, the fact that it was precisely the Etruscans who introduced that world of gods to Rome receives a new and vital importance.

The god Poseidon bears, as has long been recognized, no proper name, but is designated as the 'lord' or 'husband of the earth', that is to say, of *Δᾱ* or *Δα-μάρη*. In this, scholars

have tried to find a symbol of the general subjection of the male to the female in the pre-Homeric world of gods.⁵¹ If this is so, it will be important that the Etruscans seem to have adopted that designation of the earth-god in its original meaning.⁵² Behind the *Tellurus Terraeque pater*, who stands in the Etruscan sky-temple beside Ceres-Demeter (Martian. Capella 1, 49) we may perhaps look for the divine lord of the earth. If this is correct,⁵³ there is revealed not only an historical connexion of the Etruscans with the pre-Homeric world, which enabled them still to understand the primitive meaning of Poseidon and of his name, but also a mutual kinship of nature. With the earth-mother and the husband named after her the human sphere can at once be compared. There, too, we have on Etruscan inscriptions the description of a man as husband of a particular woman; ⁵⁴ in this, as in the designation by descent from the mother, that primacy of the female found its palpable expression.

Chapter V

THE ROMAN FORM

ALREADY we have found ourselves compelled to emphasize the peculiarities of a Roman form in face of all that could be recognized of community with the surrounding world of ancient Italy and of the ancient Mediterranean in general. These peculiarities consisted in this, that Rome, despite all her contact with, all her borrowing from those other spheres, yet transformed and reshaped them in a manner that could not be traced at once to its final causes. We have to accept it as something final, a specific form, peculiar to Rome.

We came upon the question in a specially emphatic form when we were discussing the Genius. We are now directly compelled to indicate, as the completion of the story of Rome's contacts with her neighbours, the points in which she was distinguished from them, in which she was her very own and original self. In the case of a phenomenon as important and individual as Rome, a special interest is evoked by those traits, in which her individuality first, or, if we prefer it, from the very beginning expressed itself.

1. THE KINGSHIP

To the fixed structure of the old calendar belongs the division of the course of the month into Kalends, Nones and Ides. Of these the first got their name from the *calare* of the *pontifex minor*; he announces on the Capitol at the Curia Calabra on what day the Nones fall and when the announcement of the festivals for the rest of the month will ensue (Varro, *de l. l.* 6, 27; *fast. Praenest.* on the 1st of January; CIL I, 1^a, p. 231). Before doing so, the same officer of the college of pontifices ¹ had brought news to the

rex sacrificulus of the appearance of the new moon and had assisted him in offering a sacrifice (Macrob., *Sat.* 1, 15, 9). The announcement of the days of festival, on the other hand, belonged to the king alone; he made it from the citadel to the country-folk, who streamed for the occasion into the city (Varro, *l. c.* 28; cp. 13; Macrob., *l. c.* 12).

This process, which goes back into the very earliest times ² and was implied in the existence of Kalends and Nones, shows a decisive rôle played by the king in the fixing of the calendar. It is unmistakable that the real stress falls on the observation and appearance of the moon; and, in accordance with this, the activity of the king seems to be restricted to the regulation of the times of festivals within the frame of each separate month. In a well-known stanza ³ Catullus speaks of the moon as dividing up the course of the year by the months (84, 17 f.); so the step from one to other will not be so very great. We shall, in fact, see that the king again comes into decisive prominence at the end of the sacral year. But, to prove this, we must go back a little way.

Beside two days in the calendar, the 24th of March and the 24th of May, is found the annotation, Q.R.C.F. That this is to be read, Q(uando) R(ex) C(omitiavit) F(as), was already seen by the ancient commentators, Varro (*de l. l.* 6, 31) and Verrius Flaccus (Paul. Fest. p. 254 M.; *fast. Praenest.* on the 24th of March, CIL I, 1³, p. 234, where a conflicting explanation is rejected). That meant to say, that on both those days men could only go about their civil business, after the king had performed the function described in the word *comitiare*. We have to do, then, with *dies fissi*, days which were only set free after the completion of a religious act.⁴

But did this *comitiare* consist of such a religious act? Mommsen, at least,⁵ made up his mind that by it was meant the holding of the Comitia by the king. Here, he thought, was retained in the calendar a function of the 'real' king, which could obviously only be applied to him and not to the sacrificial king of the Republican order.

This interpretation, at first glance, is most seductive. But we must not forget that the holding of the Comitia was expressed by such phrases as *comitia habere, facere, gerere*,⁶ never by *comitiare*.⁷ And indeed the ancients under-

stood what happened in quite another way. The explanation of Verrius Flaccus, *quando rex sacrificulus divinis rebus perfectis in comitium venit* (Paul. Fest. p. 259 M.), speaks only of a sacrifice and an ensuing entry into the Comitium, a definite part of the Forum. Nor is Varro's explanation very different. His words, *quod eo die rex sacrific[i]culus †dicat* (so the manuscripts) *ad comitium, ad quod tempus, est nefas, ab eo fas: itaque post id tempus lege actum saepe*, attest only a *dicere ad comitium*, by which we cannot in any case understand a holding of the Comitia. O. Hirschfeld's easy correction of *dicat* into *litat*⁸ would bring us to a sacrifice in Varro, too; that in any case we may see in *comitiare* a sacral act is proved not only by the agreement with the notice in the Epitome of Festus, but also by a further consideration.

Wissowa,⁹ as it seems to me, did well to point out, that, on the 24th of March and the 24th of May, the Salii came into activity in some way or other; so much at least seems to emerge from the broken passage in Festus (p. 278 M.). This is the more important, as both days follow immediately on the festivals designated as *Tubilustrium*.¹⁰ The first of them, on the 23rd of March, was proper to Mars, the second, on the 23rd of May, to Volcanus.¹¹ It is important to note, that at least at the festival of Mars the Salii again appeared.¹² This connexion seems to confirm the view that the activity of the king, which is described by *comitiare*, was primarily of a sacral character.

If we are at liberty to make any guesses about the days characterized as Q.R.C.F., we may guess of the first, that it belonged to those functions of March, which, beginning about the middle of the month, or rather at the end of February, expressed the beginning of warlike activity and for that reason were proper to Mars. It is the very college of Salii that comes into action, in the *ancilia movere* of the first and the Agonium of the 17th of March.¹³ The ceremony performed by the king on the 23rd of March seems to have formed the conclusion of this cycle of festivals.

It has long since been observed, that the *Regifugium* of the 24th of February stands in definite connexion with the days that we have been discussing.¹⁴ The same day of the month, the appearance of the king and the sacrifice attested for him

ἐν ἀγορᾷ πρὸς τῷ λεγομένῳ κομιτίῳ (Plutarch, *quaest. Rom.* 63) complete the connexion. This connexion was felt as so close, that people were rather inclined to interpret the sign that we have been discussing as something like Q(uod) R(ex ex) C(omitio) F(ugerit)—a view against which a Verrius Flaccus (*fast. Praenest.* on March the 24th, CIL I, 1², p. 234) had still expressly to protest.

Yet, if we regard our tradition more closely, beside the mutual connexion a very palpable contrast is seen to exist. If Verrius Flaccus's explanation in the first two cases came to this, that the king *divinis rebus perfectis in comitium venit*, we read of the Regifugium, ἐστὶ γοῦν τις ἐν ἀγορᾷ θυσία πρὸς τῷ λεγομένῳ κομιτίῳ πάτριος, ἣν θύσας ὁ βασιλεὺς κατὰ τάχος ἀπεισιφεύγων ἐξ ἀγορᾶς (Plutarch, *l. c.*). Instead of an appearance on the Comitium we have a ritual of cursing, calling on the king to quit the Forum and clearly giving the day its name.

That here we actually grasp the earliest meaning is proved by the parallel formation of the word *Poplifugium*.¹⁵ For this, too, a ritual of cursing is expressly recorded.¹⁶ Just as etiological stories of various kinds were linked to this, so were they to the Regifugium. It was only natural that a later time should refer it to the expulsion of the kings.¹⁷ This is of further interest, inasmuch as, just as the stories about the Poplifugium were regularly associated with some event of a dark and evil character (the death of Romulus; the storm of Rome by the Gauls and the ensuing attack of the Etruscans or Latins), so too must traces of similar events have been sought for the Regifugium and its ritual of cursing.

But, even if we disregard the traditional stories entirely, the ritual and festival as a whole can hardly be understood except as a ceremony of mourning and gloom. It is at once remarkable that the Regifugium, in contrast to the similar days in March and May, is a *dies nefastus*; even more remarkable is the fact, that only one day before it came the *dies parentales* and their concluding day, the Feralia (the 21st of February), as also the Caristia, another festival of the dead (the 22nd of February). The contrast with the warlike demeanour and the new beginning of March, the start of which is already marked by the Equirria (the 27th of February), is too evident to be overlooked.

But we must take one further step, before the ceremony can be completely realized. The festivals of March were definitely marked as a new beginning, and this was true not only of the activities of war, in so far as the preparation of the army to take the field, the dedication of arms and gear for the battle find expression. With March the New Year actually begins. If we have here the beginning, then February marks the end of the year just past. For the Regifugium, which is placed on the 24th, that is to say, towards the end of the month, this has an increased appropriateness.

Moreover, just as the ceremonies of the 24th of March and the 24th of May are supplements to the Tubilustria, so is the Regifugium a supplement to the festival of the Terminalia (the 28rd of February). The god Terminus, to whom it is dedicated, does indeed usually count only as a god of demarcation of ground and soil, all even as the boundary-stone itself. But there is no doubt that the sphere of the god is not herewith exhausted. The substantive *terminus* certainly can denote the boundary-stone, but the fact that you can speak not only of *termini agrorum*, *termini urbis*, but also of a *terminus vitae*, shows that the meaning of end in time was also included. The same is true of the god. Wissowa, who has championed the narrower meaning with special force,¹⁸ supplies us with the material for understanding Terminus as expression of limitation in time as well as in space.

That the Terminalia got their name from the fact *quod is dies extremus anni constitutus*, is stated by Varro in his explanation of the Roman festivals (*de l. l.* 6, 18). Similarly Ovid describes the day as *sacrorum finis* (*Fast.* 2, 50) and Macrobius (*Sat.* 1, 13, 15 f.) and Censorinus (20, 6; 10) express themselves in similar fashion when they are discussing intercalation. It was so arranged that the Terminalia were immediately appended both to the intercalated day (*bissextum*) and the intercalated month (*mensis intercalaris*).¹⁹ Here again they are evident as the sacral conclusion of the year. We have still left the inscription CIL 6, 1925; it lays down that on the Terminalia the punishment for neglect of the *parentatio* shall fall due and therewith shows a reckoning that is orientated by the same end of the year.²⁰

In view of this I find it hard indeed to understand how Wissowa could deny the significance of Terminus as god of limitation in time as well as in space. The observation of Varro that makes so curious an impression on us, that the gods of the first two months, Janus and Terminus, *propter initia et fines* hold their place (St. Augustine, *de civ. Dei* 7, 7 = *rer. div.* 16 frg. 9 Agahd; cp. Ovid, *Fast.* 2, 51 f.) becomes intelligible the moment that we refer the second case to the end of the old year, that begins again with March, but refer Janus to the later order, in which the year began with January.

We may say, then, that the Regifugium of the 24th of February fell on the day on which the ending year also retired and disappeared. If we now consider, that the king in other cases plays a part in the calendar and festivals—the appearance of the new moon is announced to him, he proclaims the festivals in each several month, and we have therefore postulated for him a relation to the year as a whole—the conviction must be borne in on us that our last conclusion is no accident. That the king on the Regifugium, in contrast to the 24th of March, after performing the sacrifice, must not tread the Comitium, but fly with all speed, that is to say, vanish, can no more be separated from the ending and vanishing of the old year than can the opposite ceremony from the beginning of the new. Up to now, the king has only met us in the rôle of announcer of the monthly festivals; here we have to do with something of a very different character. The fact is that in his own person he represents the departure of the past year and the accomplished entry of the new, that he actually lives it through.

There is nothing to surprise us if such a ceremony stands in the closest connexion with the festivals of the dead in February. Beside the year stands the *saeculum* in Rome as the most comprehensive period of time. The original secular celebrations of the years 249 and 146, in contrast to those of Augustus and all subsequent ones, were related solely to the passing of the old *saeculum*.²¹ That is why they were appropriated to the deities of death, Dis and Proserpina. The choir of twenty-seven virgins, that appeared on this occasion, belonged from the outset to the cult of the

nether powers, as, apart from other evidence, its original appearance in the grave-paintings of Apulia shows.²² The Regifugium fits perfectly into this circle of ideas; year and *saeculum* both lead us at their close into the realm of the death-festivals.

For comparison let us adduce the forms of a state of quite another kind. Once again, however, we have to do with a sacred kingship and in this lies the possibility of a connexion with the Roman *rex*.

When the Portuguese established themselves in the south-east of Africa, they came upon the empire of the Manamatapa; the observations that were then made still enable us to grasp its structure as a whole. What concerns us here is the ordering to which the life of the king himself was subjected. Decisive for him was the calendar, which was divided up according to the seasons and the stars. In particular, it was the movements of the moon that regulated the conduct of the king. When the moon was on the wane the king withdrew from sight; when the moon was new he remained in hiding; in fact he lived, disappeared and reappeared in accordance with the phases of the heavenly body, which was set over him as norm of his life.²³

It is obvious at once that we have here an agreement with our facts. The broad fact of the Roman king's not only announcing the festivals by public proclamation month by month at the beginning of the second quarter of the moon, but also representing the year itself at the moment of its close and rebirth, disappearing with it and appearing again—all this receives definition and confirmation from this comparison.

One or two special points should be emphasized. In the circle of the ceremonies of that East African tribe there appears at the New Moon of May a sham fight, of which the king is a spectator.²⁴ This reminds us of the rôle of the Salii, that we have already noted, on the occasions of the 24th of March and the 24th of May, and also of the first Tubilustrium—only that in Africa the drum took the place of the trumpet. But perhaps most remarkable of all is the connexion between the numerous audiences and salutations of the Manamatapa, all exactly regulated by the moon, and an Etruscan custom,

which is reported by Macrobius (*Sat.* 1, 15, 13).²⁵ Among the Etruscans the king was saluted every ninth day, and questions on the most difficult matters were submitted to him. Macrobius mentions this custom in connexion with the Nones. The neighbours of Rome on the north of the Tiber, then, had a kingship that was regulated by the phases of the moon.

But a still more important connexion seems to reveal itself. In the Empire of the Manamatapa human sacrifices were customary at the yearly festivals, which might not only be selected from the circle of the nobility, but which did not even stop at the king himself. It has been observed that this phenomenon leads us to a widely diffused order of public religion, in the centre of which stands the figure of a god-king, whose fate consists in the projection of cosmic events upon earthly forms of life.²⁶ Our material, which is very old and very plentiful,²⁷ shows that there too the course of the stars is the decisive factor. At a certain conjunction of the stars, the return of which follows at definite intervals, the king himself was sacrificed to the gods. The length of this period was subjected in detail to great variation; but the sure facts that regularly appear are the ritual sacrifice of the king (or his ransom) and the identification of this king himself with the moon.

It is very tempting to link up the Roman kingship again with these ideas. The connexion with the moon is there. The *Regifugium*, as we have realized it, undoubtedly represented the projection of cosmic events on a form of earthly life. Even if a regular sacrifice of the king is missing, yet we might well suppose that the ritual of cursing, in so far as it represents a compulsion, a pressure and, therewith, a humiliation of the king, has taken the place of the sacrifice . . . Similar conclusions have been drawn, whether rightly or wrongly, in relation to other facts.²⁸

If we pursue these ideas further, we find in Italy itself the direct requirement of the slaying of the king in cult; I refer to the *Rex Nemorensis* at the shrine of Diana on the lake of Nemi.²⁹ This institution once gave J. G. Frazer his starting-point for his collection of material and for his researches on the subject of the sacrifice of the king. The

comparison between the two, the Roman king and the Rex Nemorensis, is instructive indeed.

What at once distinguishes the king of the grove from the Roman king, is this, that his slaying is not a projection of any cosmic event. Nowhere do we find a trace of any reference to a time-rhythm or to even the slightest connexion with the moon. Every holder of the royal dignity must die at the moment that a new candidate appears and conquers him in battle. Even if this was a case of sacrifice (and there is much that speaks in favour of this view),³⁰ yet the basic idea is quite a different one. In another context I have tried to show that with the shrine of Diana-Artemis was connected a kingship of the 'stranger' and that that is why the duel and the right of possession that is based on it decides the royal rank.³¹

We have, then, encountered two entirely distinct ideas inside the sphere of sacrifice of the king, the cosmic kingship and the duel of the 'stranger'. I throw out the suggestion, that the pursuit of this idea may lead to a sorting out of the ample material that has been amassed by Frazer and Frobenius round this question of the king-sacrifice. Here we must renounce the attempt, although a separation of this kind might in many cases be effected without difficulty.³² All we need do is to draw the conclusions for the institution in Rome.

With the Rex Nemorensis the bloody act of slaying always remained connected; we hear of it as late as the Empire.³³ In Rome, on the other hand, if our previous suggestion is correct, the sacrifice proper had very early been abolished. But is it really true that it ever existed? It is at once remarkable that the story of the tearing asunder of Romulus, and, with it, the idea of an actual sacrifice of the king, is associated not with our Regifugium, but with the Poplifugium of the third of July.³⁴ The name itself is decisive. It was as old as the calendar itself, that is to say as old as the union of the distinct settlements on Roman soil into a single civic community. This shows that as long as there was a Rome, there was never on the 24th of February a sacrifice of the king.

And yet an undoubted connexion with the 'cosmic' king exists; in one way or another this kind of king must have

been required for the earliest Rome that we can know. He meets us from South India as far as Mesopotamia, and thence to the east and north of Africa; how old he is is shown by his appearance in ancient Babylonia. Some offshoot or other from this circle of ideas came at a very early date from the East to Central Italy. It came, just as the pictures of the world of fable of the ancient East made their way into the early art of Italy, as pieces of ancient Eastern weaving reached the graves of Caere and Praeneste. Or it may have come to pass, just as in the last, pre-Etruscan phase of the Villanova age at Bologna (Arnoaldi) the 'tree of life' appears in monumental form with the two confronted bulls.⁸⁵ That it was precisely the Etruscans, among whom, as among the Romans, the 'moon-kingship' was realized, can hardly be regarded as accidental.

But the decisive point is not the mere fact that influence of this kind can be felt in the kingship of the earliest Rome, but rather in the form under which it was adopted and reshaped. The king stands in an unmistakable relation to the moon, but he is not himself the moon. The full and permanent identification is wanting; what we find in its place may be expressed by saying that, in place of substantial identification, an identification of acts appears. Men restrict themselves to expressing the meaning of a heavenly body, its ordering of the months, its end and the sequence of its days of festival, by a series of recurring ceremonies. Thus, on the Nones, the king announces from time to time from the citadel the ordering of the festivals.

Further, the king is not offered in sacrifice; all we have is the hint conveyed by the ritual of cursing. Here we must remember that Roman religion has a fundamental disdain for human sacrifice, a peculiarity that sets it in the sharpest contrast to the Etruscan. But, in Latium, in the close neighbourhood of Rome, ideas, as the Rex Nemorensis shows, were different.

Much more remarkable, however, is the fact that here again the character of a recurrent act appears. The ritual sacrifice of the king meant for its victim that this ceremony was a single, mighty event that as end and fulfilment rounded off his life on earth. In Rome this process was converted

into a series of cult-acts that could regularly be repeated by the same king. We recognize again the indifference to the staking of all, the staking of life itself; but we recognize at the same time, that it emphasizes that it is a series of acts, in which the relation of king to year must be expressed.

I do not think that I am going too far if I say that we have here struck a fact that is of decisive importance for the whole of Roman religion.³⁶ Its divine figures, as we shall soon see in a special sense, lacked the plastic richness, the formative quality of the Greek; in this, they are poorer than them, paler and more shadowy. The *numen* for the Roman is expressed not in the figure, but in a succession of acts, in which it encounters man, gives him model instructions and, for them, demands attention in cult (*religio*). An analogous principle seems to be present in our case, causing a series of significant acts to replace an incomparably fuller personification.

The *rex sacrificulus* is certainly no god-king. But in his actions are revealed a cosmic, that is to say, a divine ordering, a divine existence. But the fact that this appears only herein, only in a succession of actions, seems to be comparable with what we have been discussing; no complete and essential identification is expressed. Similar is the case of the 'triumphator'. He wears the dress of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, without being identical with him.³⁷ He is so only in a single act, during his procession to the Capitol, up to the moment when he lays his laurel before the god.

Yet one more remark in closing. The fact that the peculiarity, here outlined, can be felt in the case of the king himself, who is as old as Rome, confirms the point that we emphasized at the outset—how decidedly from the very first a special Roman form makes itself felt, even where we have to reckon at the same time with borrowing from other cultures.

2. THE CONCEPTION OF DEITY IN EARLY ROME

A discussion which undertakes to bring out the manner in which Rome of the earliest period represented her gods finds itself in an unenviable position. The essential condition for such a discussion—a treatment of the great

Roman deities, Jupiter and Mars, Juno and Vesta, that shall take new lines and push up to the very limit of what can be known to-day—is not yet fulfilled. We are compelled, therefore, in order to offer something at least, to confine ourselves to clearing up general principles. It is by letting the light of criticism play on the views hitherto held that we are to-day most likely to come near our goal. Our own position will be defined with much greater sharpness by the contrast than it could be by a mere exposition of its own chief points.

1

The essay of K. Latte on the Italian conception of deity³⁸ probably represents the most serious attempt yet made to illuminate the problem. It has been generally recognized as such and may therefore be taken as characteristic of the view that has till the last few years been dominant.

The conceptions of deity in Italy and Rome, we are told, are distinct indeed in degree and in details, but not in essence. An isolation of phenomena, a restriction to a circle of activity exactly defined in space or time, a tendency to 'atomize' the divine, is everywhere the original; it was only the personal gods of the Greeks, especially the great Olympians, that worked in an opposite direction. For the Italians a formless darkness lay over the suprasensual world. Only in the concrete case, in the single actual object, in the limited individual manifestation does the secret find expression. But at such individual manifestations we always stop; no attempt is made to trace them back to comprehensive figures, and, where such figures are present (whether inherited or borrowed), they are always distributed over the separate spheres that they cover.³⁹

This view, as here expressed, has in itself no element of novelty. Wissowa⁴⁰ has already emphatically observed that to the Roman deities are assigned definite, very closely limited 'spheres of competence'. He actually speaks of an 'endeavour to specialize the divine functions', and thinks that he has the right to claim this as characteristic of the religion of earliest Rome. In contrast to his view, the importance of Latte's essay lies in its universal development

of the view that he borrowed—a development which does not halt at the Roman frontier, but goes on to include the world of ancient Italy.

This extension of the form of the problem meant, of course, the necessity of segregating the Italian (now including the Roman) in its special forms from the surrounding world, and especially from the Greek. It certainly met a real need. But, on looking closer, we find that the boundaries cannot be drawn with that sharpness that seems to be indispensable for an undertaking of this character. A few examples will make this clear.

In Latte we find at the outset an appeal to the Roman 'separate gods'.⁴¹ Among others⁴² he names the *Seia Segetia Tutilina*, 'the corn-spirits, in which the power of the sprouting and ripening grain and of the guarded treasure of the granaries' is worshipped; or again, the *Querquetulanae* . . . *praesidentes querqueto virescenti* (Fest. p. 261 M.) and the Lares of Trimalchio, *Cerdo Felicio* and *Lucio* (Petron., *Sat.* 60, 8). Why these latter names, in particular, should be allowed to claim originality, is far from obvious. It is still most probable that they are introduced to characterize Trimalchio himself, that is to say, that they were invented for the occasion. *Cerdo* is a loan-word from Greek,⁴³ which appears for the first time in Novius.⁴³ As a general principle we must remember that such deities are anything but strange to the Greeks. We have the Attic hero *Κναμίτης*; ⁴⁴ we have the 'ripeners' *Ἀδρεῖς*, called *ἀπὸ τῆς καρπῶν ἀδρόνσεως* (Etym. Magn. 18, 8) or the hero *Εὐδοός*.⁴⁵ Of *Ἀκρατοπότης*, of *Μάττων* and *Κεράων*, of *Δειπνεύς*, *Δαίτης* and others, that have been collected by the erudition of Usener,⁴⁶ it can hardly be denied that they too are characterized by 'isolation of phenomena, a restriction to a circle of activity exactly defined in space or time'.⁴⁷ The same is true of them that has been maintained of the 'separate deities' of Rome.

The view of Latte, however, is that the same characteristics hold on the side of Rome and Italy for the great gods as well. At this point we must examine more closely a second example that he adduces.

Gellius 18, 29, quotes from Varro ⁴⁸ a list of deities, which have long since attracted interest. *Lua Saturni*, *Salacia*

Neptuni, Hora Quirini, Maia Volcani, Nerio Martis—these are the forms of invocation that meet us here. They appear always in a special form—to a female deity in the nominative is appended a second, usually male deity, in the genitive. Whilst, in the second place, we have always to do with universally known deities, Saturnus, Neptunus, Quirinus and Volcanus, the feminine names in the nominative are either rarely attested, or else do not even occur anywhere else.

Latte's view ⁴⁹ is to this effect: the 'nominative' names, Lua, Salacia, Hora, Maia, Nerio—to restrict ourselves to these examples—originally did not denote independent deities. They denoted abstractions, expressions of a power or a will, issuing from the chief gods whose names are added in the genitive case. One example will illustrate the point; 'the general conception, which is associated with Neptunus, is specialized and narrowed for the gushing spring, in which you see at work the *Salacia Neptuni*, his power to make water "gush", *salire*'. ⁵⁰ It is precisely this specialization which is to be thought of as Roman and, as Umbrian and Samnite parallels prove, Italian in general. It was only in course of time that the separate manifestations of the great gods that thus arose became detached from their original spheres and grew into independent deities of minor range.

One objection to this view suggests itself at once; in the case of a number of the feminine names of deities, which are given in the nominative, we may with some certainty rule out the possibility of their having originally been mere manifestations of the great gods. Rather, they are evident from the first as independent, and this fact is in itself enough to exclude Latte's view, which has no meaning except as the formulation of a general truth.

From Latte's own position ⁵¹ it cannot be denied that Lua appears early as an individual and independent figure, free from any connexion with Saturn (Livy 8, 1, 6; 45, 33, 1). Whether she ever existed in another form cannot be demonstrated; it is hardly likely, because of the name *mater*, which is specially applied to deities of the earliest circle.⁵² For Hora we may claim a very high antiquity, as it cannot be mistaken that the *gens Horatia* derives its name from the goddess.⁵³ The first historical bearer of the name Horatius

(neglecting the mythical) is the consul, who stands among others under the first year of our list of consuls. His authenticity is assured by the fact that he gave his name on the architrave of the temple of Capitoline Jupiter⁵⁴ as dedicator. Nor should we forget that the *gens* as a whole offered a sacrifice that is certainly very old⁵⁵ on the Kalends of October to the *tigillum sororium*.⁵⁶

Further, the linguistic interpretation of the names of female deities as abstracts, as qualities or expressions of a power, is exposed to the most serious objections, as has long since been seen.⁵⁷ In many cases it may definitely be ruled out of account. Here again an example may make this plain.

That the name of Maia is to be explained linguistically as 'the uncontrolled might of fire'⁵⁸ has not yet been seriously proved and is hardly likely to be proved in future. Even the existence of a Jupiter Maius in Tusculum (Macrobius, *Sat.* 1, 12, 17) can scarcely be adduced as an argument in favour of this view. For where could we ever find Jupiter associated with the raging of fire? Even if a subsequent identification of an original *deus Maius* with the lord of the sky took place,⁵⁹ still the association of a fire-god with Jupiter would remain as inexplicable as ever. The correct view was long ago expressed by J. Wackernagel; Maia is the 'great' one (*Jupiter Maius* or *deus Maius* has this and no other meaning—an analogy to Jupiter Optimus Maximus). But this 'great' one is a correct designation of the Earth and the Earth-Mother; the ancient Indian *māhī-* and the Greek *Μεγάλη*⁶⁰ are parallels that force themselves on our notice.⁶¹ To find this Earth-Mother associated with Vulcanus-Hephaistos should not in view of our other evidence surprise us.⁶²

Finally, we can hardly consider it a confirmation of Latte's position, if he associates with the list, recorded by Gellius, a case like that of *Ops Consiva*.⁶³ It is certainly true that adjective and genitive originally possess the same function⁶⁴ and so, on grounds of grammar as well as of fact, that *Ops Consiva* or *Consivia* should be interpreted like *Maia Volcani* or *Lua Saturni*. But we have no more right in this case to regard the origin of Ops as consisting in a mere manifestation of the male deity ('the harvest-blessing of Consus') than

we had in the cases dealt with before. Just as, beside *Lua Saturni* we found *Lua mater*, we find again beside *Ops Consiva*: *Ops mater*. In the earliest calendar the existence of the two forms can be grasped; beside the *Opiconsivia* of the 25th of August appears the *Opalia* of the 19th of December as an independent festival.⁶⁵ Finally, we must attack Latte's arguments from a third point. I mean, the point that he regards the linking of deities of the form of *Lua Saturni* or *Ops Consiva* as something at once definitely Italian. It is, of course, correct, that the connexion by adjective appears commonly in Oscan and Umbrian religion. On the inscription of Agnone (Planta, no. 200; Conway, no. 175) appear names like *hereklái kerríiúí*, '*Herculi Cereali*', *maatúís kerríiúís*, '*Manibus Cerealibus*', and a long series of other deities designated by the same appellation; one and all they are placed by it in connexion with Ceres. On the tables of Iguvium, again, we have besides the simple *Sérse Martie* the complicated *Prestota Sérfia Sérfer Martier*, where two adjectival combinations are linked to one another.⁶⁶ But Etruscan religion gives us the parallel *turns aitas*,⁶⁷ the *Ἐρμῆς Ἀίδου*. In Greece, too, we meet *Ζεὺς Ἀγείως*, *Ἀθηνᾶ Ἡφαιστία*, *Ἀθηνᾶ Ἀγεία*, *Ἀφροδίτη Ἀγεία*.⁶⁸

This kind of association of deities, then, is extended far beyond the sphere of Italy proper. There is nothing to make us look there for its origin or its special sphere of extension. On the contrary, we may say that Greece has sometimes supplied the model for Italy. It may be regarded as certain that the goddess with the Oscan name *Mámpersa*⁶⁹ was copied from *Ἀθηνᾶ Ἀγεία*.⁷⁰

This should mean the end of any hope of finding a peculiarity of Italian religion on the path hitherto pursued. And yet, as I think, the attempt, and even the particular effort made by Latte, need not at once be condemned to failure. But it requires a sharper distinction and delimitation than has up to now been applied to it. Such conceptions as single manifestation of the divine, specialization and narrowing down, are too vague, they do not nearly enough lead us to the spiritual ideas that lie at their roots to justify their further use. But above all we must keep open a question, to which an answer has hitherto been far too readily given. We must

seriously consider, whether Italian and Roman, far from coinciding, do not rather possess each its individual form. It may indeed be that the Roman form grew out of the surrounding world of Italy, that that world was its necessary condition. But we should have to decide where to lay the emphasis, where to seek the decisive spiritual event—at the point where Rome went hand in hand with Italy, or where she went beyond her.

2

We may begin by setting in contrast two peculiarities of the cult of Ceres. In the Samnite cult of Agnone the inscription, which has kept the record of it, names a series of *σύννοιο θεοί*. A circle of deities, all marked by the name *kerrio-*, as connected with Ceres, is grouped round the Earth-Mother, and Latte does not hesitate to designate them, in accordance ⁷¹ with his general view, as manifestations or, to be more precise, as specializations of that one form that stands in the centre. We need not here insist how difficult it would be to prove that the nymphs (*diūmpais*), the rain-showers (*anafriss* ⁷²), or the Manes (*maatris*) could represent such manifestations—to omit other possible objections. For, even admitting that Latte's view was as correct as it is certainly the opposite, there would still remain a very essential difference between this and the Roman cult of Ceres.

In an often quoted passage of the Servius Dan. (on *Georg.* 1, 21)—the author quotes Fabius Pictor—the gods are listed, whom the *flamen Cerealis* was wont to invoke at the beginning of seed-time.⁷³ They are twelve in number, but among them appears neither Ceres herself nor other goddesses such as Tellus or Flora, of similar or identical nature. In the names of these gods we are confronted with 'nomina agentis', which in each case denote a special partial function and in their totality cover the whole circle of work in the field. Beginning with the *Vervactor* and the *Redarator* they go down to the *Convactor* and the *Promitor*.

Here again there has been talk of a tendency to specialize.⁷⁴ As a matter of fact, all these activities and their divine exponents belong to the realm of the Earth-Mother; *sacrum*

Cereale faciens Telluri et Cereri, says Servius expressly of the *flamen*. The possibility of comparison, even of similarity to the Samnite cult is quite open. But yet there is one fact—and a fundamental one—that separates the Roman series from the other.

If we once admit, as we have suggested, for Agnone, that we have to do with a specialization of a more extensive divine field, divided into smaller, less comprehensive deities, these would appear here side by side, and would be like the fragments of a whole that could be remade out of them. In Rome, on the other hand, the carrying out of field-work is divided into acts which are accomplished in sequence. In place of a coexistence, for which the factor of time is irrelevant, we find an order which underlines that very element of time, and which for that reason cannot be altered, not to say reversed, in its course. If we disregard the character of these acts as such, this temporal sequence certainly represents something that occurs only in Rome and has nothing to correspond to it on the Italian side. And this peculiar character extends yet further; not only the succession of the deities, but also the point of their appearance—the yearly recurrent beginning of seed-time—⁷⁵ is sharply marked. Only then and on no other occasion do they come into action.

With the appearance of the *flamen Cerealis* has been associated a second kind of cult practices. At certain atoning sacrifices, which the Arval Brethren undertake, to atone for the removal of trees from the sacred grove, the action is again divided up into a series of single acts and to these in each case divine character is assigned.⁷⁶ There appear, *Deferunda* for the felling, *Commolenda* for the chopping up, *Coinquenda* for the breaking into faggots,⁷⁷ *Adolenda* for the burning of the fragments that remain for disposal. The evidence for deities and sacrifice is not earlier than the Empire. But the old use of the gerundive in the four names, without the idea of obligation that later attached to it,⁷⁸ the old-fashioned nature of the operation of thinning out and clearing a wood and the associated worship of the gods in sacred groves,⁷⁹ finally, the great age of the whole Arval ritual and of the Brotherhood itself, all these suggest that we should

date them to a very early period, perhaps to the very earliest of Roman religion.⁸⁰

We must observe at this point that, in the acts of the Arval Brethren, a sequence of these deities, such as might correspond to that of the actions in question, is not given. The deities are arranged in alphabetical order. The reason is obvious. There is question not of an invocation, as with the twelve *numina* of the *flamen Cerealis*, but of a sacrifice. This sacrifice is made by the Arval Brethren to these deities in common; they represent here a closed unity as opposed to other gods, not a sequence established once and for all.

If the sequence, which was so obvious in the cult of Ceres, does not appear in our case, and can at most be described as an ideal one, that can be divined under the traditional order (although not carried through in practice), yet in another peculiarity we encounter a factor of importance for our purposes. The appearance of the four deities in the Arval ritual is not, like the invocation of the *numina* by the *flamen Cerealis*, connected with a ceremony of sacrifice recurring regularly spring by spring, but represents a solitary act, recorded under year and day in the acts of the Brotherhood. The appearance of Deferunda, Commolenda, Coinquenda, and Adolenda is conditioned by a single, in the fullest sense of the word, historical occurrence (growth of a fig-tree on the architrave of the shrine; stroke of lightning on the sacred grove). The character of these deities, then, is revealed not in supratemporal existence, standing above the human or even the natural sphere, but in these very historical events. To put it in other words, it reveals itself in history and nowhere else. It is not difficult to find further evidence for the view here implied.

8

The examples so far adduced either came definitely from the earliest stratum of Roman religion or could, on general principles, be referred with some probability to it. That is to say, they belonged to that stratum which is mainly represented for us by the earliest calendar and by the circle of festivals and deities that appear in it and which the Romans themselves were wont to call the 'religion of Numa'. But

we may be permitted to cast a glance beyond it for a short time on to later stages. To get a clear view of later development and continuation often helps one to grasp the original itself more clearly; the ripened form helps us to discover the beginnings, which are present only in germ and are therefore difficult to distinguish. The two together, then, not only illuminate one another, but mutually confirm one another in their results.

Latte⁸¹ points to the fact that 'the Greek Tyche in Roman environment loses her meaning as the bearer of the inexorable fate that is linked to all events, and appears as *Fortuna huius loci*, *huius diei*, or *haec Fortuna*, and is thus linked to the individual event, as *Fortuna Tulliana*, *Crassiana* (Dessau 3717, 3714), that is to say, to the individual man. But Tyche too reveals herself in many quarters as the Tyche of single place and people; in this point, there is no difference, of principle at least, between the *τύχη Ἀλεξανδρείας* or the Tyche of a king and the prevailing use in Rome.⁸² It is quite remarkable to observe how the famous saying of Caesar, when he reminded the boatman, who shirked the storm, of the Tyche of the great man, has been claimed by an authority on Greek religion as evidence for Greek belief in Fate,⁸³ whilst Latte on the other hand sees in it a specifically Roman sentiment.⁸⁴

And yet in one point a difference between the two peoples does exist; it consists in the emphasis on the temporal element. The *Fortuna huius diei*, at least, has no parallel on the Greek side. The singularity of one special day, particularly of a day of decisive historical or political importance⁸⁵ and the *Fortuna* assigned to it, means something definitely Roman. That reminds us at once how in Plautus the single day already has its special and non-recurring character.⁸⁶ We remember, too, how in Roman history the day and hour of death, in fact, the individual moment, as a whole, in the art of Roman triumphs and history, was raised to an importance hitherto unknown.⁸⁷

In the erection of temples this relation of the single historical event to the divine is revealed. The vowing of a temple usually takes place at a special moment, with a particular, not recurring character; in the moment of

danger (*in medio discrimine pugnae*)⁸⁸ or of decision,⁸⁹ or at such extraordinary occasions as an earthquake.⁹⁰ Noteworthy, too, is the evocation of enemy gods; house and cult are offered them in Rome, if they will desert their former home. 'This evocation is only undertaken, when the enemy city is ripe for storm; it is the very last act before the decision.'⁹¹

Here everything is concentrated on single decisive acts; the special quality of the different moments of history is persistently felt. We may add that for all Roman temples the year and day, not only of dedication, but also of vowing, lives on in memory. This is in complete contrast to the procedure in Greece, where such historical relationships, even where they exist, usually remain unimportant.⁹²

One step more and we actually find deities whose whole existence is based on their manifestation at a particular hour of history.

At the beginning of his essay Latte compares an episode in Roman history with one in Greek. Before the Battle of Marathon, Pan appears to the messenger, sent to Sparta, in the wooded hills of Arcadia. He promises the Athenians his help and demands in return a permanent cult in Athens. A dwelling under the hill and a yearly festival are his reward after victory was won (Herodotus 6, 105). In Rome, too, we know of a divine appearance at just a critical moment. Before the approach of the Gauls a voice in the night warns the Romans to fortify walls and gates, and points to the impending fall of the city. Again, the result is the institution of a cult; its bearer receives his name from the manner of his appearance and is worshipped as Aius Locutius, or as Plutarch translates it (*Cam.* 30; *fort. Rom.* 5) as *Φημὴ καὶ Κληδών*.⁹³

It is, no doubt, correct to say that 'to the Greek the appearance of the god quite unconsciously and undesignedly takes on a plastic and visible shape' and 'becomes the lord of the mountainous land in which he dwells'. Nor less is it certain that in Rome the warning by night remains formless; it remains mere voice, mere sound, and as such receives its name, without being associated with any of the great gods, who had up to then arisen.⁹⁴ The only question is whether

we are justified, in the second case, in talking of a lack—a lack of speculative and imaginative power, perhaps, as has been suggested.⁹⁶ Would it not be wiser, first of all to understand this peculiarity, which is undeniably present in the Roman conception of deity, first to take it seriously, before proceeding to a final verdict on it?

It might be that the Roman consciously refused to go beyond the single warning, linked to one definite, historical moment. And the reason may have been that he gave to that historical moment, and, in fact, to history as a whole, a peculiar importance, because history was rooted in his sense of the world in quite exceptional depth and power.

But, if that is so, we should have to adopt a very different valuation. Whereas to the Greek the single manifestation in time has always no more than accessory value, whereas even in the divine world everything is revealed as a being beyond time, on the other side the single manifestation can rise to a point at which it can overshadow, even replace being. The Roman conception of deity, that is eminently historical and reveals itself in time, confronts the supra- and extra-temporal nature of the Greek gods as an independent and intelligible world of its own. Being and time, ontology and history can always be confronted as independent spiritual realms, each resting on its own base.

4

The discussion of our subject would be incomplete, were we to leave unmentioned that characteristic conception of Roman religion, the *numen*.⁹⁷ With it we return to that earliest stratum of Roman religion which we had for the moment left.

The word *numen* is everywhere employed, where a divine action, an activity or function is meant. Cicero renders the Homeric θεῶν λόγῳ (μ 190) by *divino numine* (*de fin.* 5, 49). In another passage he uses *vis divina* as synonymous with *numen deorum* (*de div.* 2, 124). Similarly, you can speak in particular of a *numen Jovis*, *Cereris* or of any other god. It denoted merely the logical development of the basic conception, if you came to speak of various *numina* of one god. The manifestations and activities of that god can be distinct,

not only in point of time, but also in kind. Juno herself speaks in the *Aeneid* (7, 297) of her *numina* in the plural,⁸⁷ and another passage in the same poem is explained thus: *Juno multa habet numina; est Curritis . . . est regina . . . sunt et alia eius numina* (Servius on *Aen.* 1, 8).

On the other hand, a god, when he expresses himself in a special direction or action and when that expression, for the immediate present, forms the focus of interest, can be designated simply as *numen*. It is his working and activity, not his whole nature or his shape, that is in the first place intended. A dedication *numini Apollini*, *numini Iovi*, must describe these gods in that special quality, as it were, as divine act. We are indeed told that such uses do not occur until the Empire.⁸⁸ But there are various considerations that dispose us to assume them for the very earliest age.

At this point a verse of Lucilius gains a new importance. The fragment 895 (Marx) is usually read in this form: *Apollost numen, qui te antiquis non sinet deliciis maculam atque ignominiam imponere*. In the latest treatment, however, we are reminded that the manuscripts of Nonius, in whom the verse is recorded (p. 24, 9), unanimously give *nomen* and that its replacement by *numen* rests on conjecture. That the traditional reading is the right one, we are told, is evident from the fact that both in the comment of Nonius and in the fragment of Lucilius himself there is a contrast between the ideas of *nomen* and *ignominia*. The two confirm one another, and we must keep to the tradition in Lucilius.

It is certainly true that Nonius interprets *ignominia* as *nominis nota*, and the same holds good of the quotation from Cicero's fourth Book on the state. The verse of Lucilius, on the other hand, has no etymological intention. Its meaning is difficult. According to F. Marx's guess, it is spoken of a boy, who denotes his rich or powerful lover as Apollo, for which parallels can be quoted.⁸⁹ Be that as it may, in any case what is meant is that the god will not allow that the character of disgrace (*ignominia*) shall be attached to certain forms of enjoyment. Why Apollo should here be designated as *nomen* has not yet been explained and has been left thus unexplained even by those who have championed the traditional text. The alteration to *numen*, on the other

hand, would give a complete sense.¹⁰⁰ If Apollo will not admit of something taking place, it is because he will enter the lists against the real or supposed injustice, because he will prevent it by virtue of his divine power. Of necessity he reveals himself in such a case as active working and interference—in brief, in his character as *numen*.¹⁰¹

One of our earliest pieces of literary evidence, then, may give us the word *numen* in this pregnant sense. But the fact that, in the god, it is the activity and the act that is mainly felt, can be traced yet earlier. Two gods of the earliest Roman circle have names which bear unmistakable witness to this. They are gods who cannot boast either Etruscan or Greek origin, but who may be traced back to a pre-Roman, Indo-Germanic or ancient Mediterranean stratum. Nor are they such gods as were common to the Romans and the Latins or any other Italian people. Both gods appear originally only in our city; both name and character, then, may claim a specifically Roman nature.

The two gods in question are Consus and Janus. The former is for Latte¹⁰² none other than the treasurer of the stored harvest, the second the sacred power of the single door. Both belonged, we are told, to those deities of Rome, who 'were simply exponents of a single force, which was felt as divine, or of the forces that issued from a single object'.

Against this, we should remind ourselves that Janus, regarded from the point of view of his linguistic formation, does not denote a concrete object, but is an abstraction. To put it more exactly, he represents a 'nomen actionis'. Janus is the 'going' (old Indian, *yāna-*), and the door (*ianua*) is certainly not the origin of the god, but the reverse; it is the door which is derived from the god. For from his name, which appears also as a *u*-stem (dative *Ianui*¹⁰³), the name of the door is derived, just as is the name of the *mensis Ianuarius*.¹⁰⁴ The single concrete object, then, is subordinated to the god, the god has not grown out of the object.

The case as here stated has long since been made clear;¹⁰⁵ it is in itself so convincing, that one cannot conceive from what quarter any objection can be raised against it. The conclusions for Consus can at once be drawn. His name,

too, appears originally as a *u*-stem,¹⁰⁶ as the derived *Consualia* proves. To judge from the formation, *Consus*, -*ūs*, should be a -*tu*- abstract noun, comparable to *cantus*, -*ūs* or to *cursus*, -*ūs*, and belonging to the verb *condere*; ¹⁰⁷ for the sound formation we may compare *caesus* from **caid-tos* or *salsus* from **sald-tos*.¹⁰⁸ The name of the god, then, can only mean the 'hiding'; it is usually referred to the hiding and garnering of the harvest in particular, whether rightly or not we have still to inquire. In any case, the linguistic form points unmistakably to an activity.

We must, then, register the fact that two of the earliest names of Roman gods mark the nature of their bearers as an activity. The phenomenon is not without parallels in the Italian sphere. On the Umbrian tables of Iguvium we find a designation which expresses the similar conception of an action or an activity, perhaps does so even more sharply and unmistakably than on the Roman side. There appear side by side *ahtu iuvip.* and *ahtu marti* (IIa 10-11), which can only be understood as datives, '*actui Iovi patri*' and '*actui Marti*'.¹⁰⁹ In that case, what is here spoken of is not an *actus Iovis*, but an *actus Iupiter*; not an action of the god would be mentioned, but the god himself would be described as such an activity, such an act, if we may use the word.

The agreement with the names of the gods, Janus and Consus, as also with the pregnant use of the word *numen*, as a whole, is seen at once. Umbrian *ahtu iuvip.* and a Roman dedication *numini Iovi* (CIL. 8, 9195) correspond exactly, and correspond too in the prominence given to the decisive idea; in each case Jupiter is meant in his quality of act.

The facts further reveal that this character of the god as act is not only very old, but that it is not confined to Rome. A conception as decisive for Roman religion as that of *numen* was based on an order of ideas, that was characteristic of other Italians too, at least of the Umbrian people.

This very contact, precisely because it is beyond question, must spur us on to discover a specifically Roman element. The community with Italy forces on us the question of the special and peculiar quality of Rome. Where we have to

look for this can hardly be doubtful after all that we have already established.

The *actus Jupiter*, as it appears at Iguvium, is mere act, without more precise determination of its appearance. It lacks, above all, any fixation in time. Janus, on the other hand, though linguistically he means the 'going', yet, as a matter of fact, as we know, means above all the beginning. Janus is the god of all commencement. The same is true of Consus, except that with him it is not the beginning, but the conclusion that is meant.

The god Consus is nowadays referred exclusively to the hiding of the harvest,¹¹⁰ and this is beyond doubt correct, if we have in view the *Consualia* of the 21st of August. The *condere* of the harvested fruit of the field (*condus promus* Plaut., *Pseud.* 608; *Conditor Promitor* in the list of *numina*, already quoted, which the *flamen Cerealis* invokes: Servius Dan., *Georg.* 1, 21) denotes the conclusion of the work of the field. But it is very much harder to explain the festival of the 15th of December that bears the same name. Wissowa thought of the threshing, but neither can the name and activity of Consus be linked to that, nor is there any ancient evidence that would point to it; we have only a mere, not very probable assertion.

A further consideration presses itself on our notice. By the *Consualia* of the 21st of August stand the *Opiconsivia* on the 25th of the same month. On this day *Ops mater* is connected with Consus, as is expressed both in the name of the festival and in the name of the goddess (*Ops Consiva*). This fact has been justly quoted as evidence for the connexion of Consus with the harvest. On the other hand, the *Consualia* of the 15th of December was again followed by a day of *Ops* on the 19th; but, as the name of the festival, *Opalia*, shows, on this occasion the goddess does not advertise her connexion with her male partner. If we now ask the question, what kind of *condere* can be meant at this second festival, we must remember that the verb is not limited to the sense of hiding and, therewith, of completing the work of the fields. A second meaning meets us, and precisely in sacral context. *Saeculum condere* means originally¹¹¹ the burying and ending of the old *saeculum*;

lustrum condere is used in the same sense.¹¹² It is natural, then, to suppose that the festival of Consus in December meant nothing else than the hiding and conclusion of the old year. In that case, it would have had, for the year that began with January and ended with December, a similar function to that of the Terminalia of the 28rd of February for that other year that began with March and found its end in February.¹¹³

Be this as it may, there appears in Rome, in place of the timeless divine act, which meets us at Iguvium, the determination in time. The gods Janus and Consus are in name and significance related to the beginning and end of an activity.¹¹⁴ They are related, not to a continuous activity, undefined in time, but rather to an exactly determined point of time. Peculiar to them is the character of definiteness and precision. The same can be proved of another divine name in Rome.

The linguistic meaning of *genius* can hardly be subject to any doubt. The connexion with the root *gen-* is obvious.¹¹⁵ We must, however, point out, that the name of the god is derived not from the reduplicated present, *gigno*, but from the aoristic root¹¹⁶ (cp. *γίγνομαι* and *ἐγενόμην*); it denotes not 'he who begets', but 'he who has begotten', and therewith emphasizes the result and conclusion as the decisive element.¹¹⁷ Just as the Genius as god is always subordinated to an individual man, so is his activity related to an individual and important moment. That is why the birthday, above all, is sacred to this Genius, the day on which the procreation of the man became manifest.

We may take yet one step farther. In the case of Janus and Consus, even in that of Genius himself, we have to do with events that are indeed fixed in time, but that recur at intervals. But, once again, the definition of the *numen* in time can advance from such recurrence to a single historical action—the same process as that that we have already realized in our previous discussion.

Cicero in one passage says that the force and *numen* of a god are revealed in prodigies (*in Verr.* 4, 107). By the word *prodigium* the Romans meant such events within the sphere of nature or human life, as, by their exceptional character,

seemed to contain the suggestion, that the good understanding between state and gods (*pax et venia deum*) was disturbed, if not destroyed. Such prodigies by no means point to a certainly predestined disaster; leaving its specific character in the dark, they only indicate that destruction is impending in the nearer or remoter future. They require the most careful attention and appeasement, if this good understanding with the gods is to be restored.¹¹⁸

At first sight, we seem to have to do with no more than a necessary inference, that follows from that conception of the god as act that the Italians held. If the divine was no mere being, but if it expressed itself in work and activity, the chief form of such activity must consist in the indications that it imparted from time to time to its human worshippers. But again we find in Rome a new factor of decisive importance.

The prodigies, of which we have spoken, are not mere indications, which may occur now and again without any precise definition in time; no, it is of special import, at what moment they appear. Whether in critical days before threatening dangers or extensive operations, or revealed within a period of apparent peace, the occasion and historical context within which a prodigy occurs are always of supreme importance. That is why Roman historians turned their attention to prodigies; the annalists, Livy, Tacitus, are full of accounts of them. In the little book of Julius Obsequens we have actually a special list of all the prodigies, that were recorded in the work of Livy from the year 190 B.C. onwards.

We have an exceptional piece of evidence for the early date to which this fixing of prodigies to time and year extends. In an often-quoted passage Cato the Elder endeavours to emphasize the special quality of his history as against such older forms and attempts as were there before him. He had no inclination, he says, to write the sort of thing that stood on the wooden tablet of the *pontifex maximus*; how often high prices or an eclipse of sun or moon had occurred. What Cato alludes to is the whitened tablet, which was set up in the official residence of the pontifex and intended, year by year, to record the names of the magistrates and the most important events, as seen from the point of view of

the college of 'pontifices'. The words that we have quoted enable us to realize that precisely the prodigies must have formed a notable part of this earliest historical record. For heavenly phenomena appear as a regular part in our reports ; and, as far as scarcity is concerned, we need only refer to the causes that are given in our tradition for the introduction of the deities Ceres, Liber and Libera to Rome (Dion. Hal. 6, 17, 8 ; 496 B.C.).

We do not know when the pontifical records were first taken in hand. Beyond doubt, they presume the existence of writing, but with the introduction of writing we come to the age of the earliest calendar or of the fibula of Praeneste.¹¹⁹ It may at least be taken as certain, that this custom extends into earlier times than the records that are still in existence, of which after-times had authentic knowledge.¹²⁰ Without some such procedure both the lists of consuls and the earliest dates of temples are impossible.¹²¹

With these prodigies and the record of them we have, it seems, hit upon something that is primitively Roman. From the very first, the Romans must have represented their history to themselves as a chain of actions, which were guided by constant indications from the gods and, through unwearied questioning in accordance with those indications, were brought into harmony with the divine will.¹²² Nor did this picture change in later times. Beside the prodigies appear the Sibylline Books and the Etruscan Books of Fate ; there appears too the activity of the haruspices. Into quite early times extends the observation of birds ; on no official occasion did one neglect to seek the information that they had to give. No less an event than the foundation of the city itself is said to have followed on the grounds of such an indication ; the beginning of Roman history is marked by the *augustum augurium* of Romulus.

It is only the counterpart to a history controlled by divine guidance, that Rome's gods on their side should have preferred to reveal themselves, not in actions beyond time, but in single, historical acts.

Chapter VI

THE AGE OF ROMAN MYTH

1. GENERAL REMARKS

IT is only with some hesitation that one dares speak of Roman myth. Yet the unfavourable verdict that overshadows it is of quite recent date. Niebuhr, for all that he was so inexorable a critic of the fabrication of early Roman history, could yet speak of 'noble myth' and was prepared to grant it a place in his narrative. For Usener, too, Roman folk-stories were still his ultimate data, a tradition to which he adopted an attitude not distinct from his attitude to the Greek. It was Wissowa who first declared war on the mythological stories, and especially on the mythological poetry of Rome. In his view, these were, almost without exception, composed on the model of the Greek myth. The stories of gods and heroes could not, then, as he thought, be used at all, or only with the greatest caution, for Roman religion; in no case could one speak of myth that was originally Roman.

Wissowa could not, indeed, deny that in Greek as in Roman poetry, stories of an etiological character appear, which seek to interpret the institution of some cult or other. But, whilst the Greek poets drew their legends from a popular tradition or from one connected with definite shrines, and confined themselves to inventing further within the frame thus given, the mythological stories of a Propertius or an Ovid were deliberate inventions—transferences of Greek models, without any root in popular myth. We have to do, we were told, with late creations, arisen at a time when the instinct to create myth was already extinct among the Romans; one must often attribute the origin to the poets themselves. Thrown back on their own fancy, they combined with one another, 'at their own sweet will', those gods

of earliest Roman cult that had become mere names without content.

These ideas answered a very general view, according to which the Romans lacked fancy and, therefore, the urge to create myth. How far this picture is a true one we shall have to discuss later. Here we must be content to show that the affirmation of the unimportance of a rich and extensive tradition must, on the most general grounds, arouse suspicion.

Even if we were to admit that we have always to do with late myths, created by particular persons, the admission would by no means involve the conclusion that they were necessarily something capricious and meaningless. On the contrary, if a poet invented a special feature or a whole myth, this might involve a very significant invention. Or, if he took over a Greek motif, he might well be conditioned by the 'form' of a myth, that was already present in germ, or by the conception of a god that came to him from general belief. The borrowed motif enabled the poet to give richer and more intelligible form to a picture already present before him. On this assumption, a variant, for which the evidence is late, or even an invention, may become significant.

In many cases, a poet will have given a myth its setting. But that is not decisive against its being a genuine myth. That world of ideas, that for the Roman was attached from the first to a practice of cult or to a god, may only have received from poetry a clearer and more comprehensive shape. What was present more or more less clearly to the mind of each individual, was transformed by deliberate creative art into a picture that gained general validity. Myth and language reveal themselves as alike in this point. What the poet makes of both of them is usually only an awakening and revelation of those powers, that lay hidden from the first in their bosom.

It is not the early or late date of origin, it is not the question whether we have to do with popular matter or invention of the poet, that is in itself decisive; it is the existence of an original kernel of myth, or, to use a conception that we have already met, of an original mythical form. Whether this was still at work in the stories that are handed down to us

can only be decided by a comparison with the cult itself. W. F. Otto was the first, in his 'Roman Myths', to make fruitful use of this way of regarding the problem.¹ Discussing the tradition about Anna Perenna² or Acca Larentia³ he showed that the same conceptions that appear in the cult also found expression in the mythical picture.

It may serve as confirmation of this procedure that the question can be put in the same way in a second, similar case. Just like Roman mythology, the etymological interpretations of antiquaries have fallen victims to a general unfavourable verdict. Modern linguistic science has made a general clearance among them and has demonstrated the incorrectness of many ancient interpretations. But, despite their incorrectness, they are not without value. Even if they cannot explain the real origin of a name of a god, for example, they may still give us a suggestion of the sort of thoughts and associations that might be connected with the name and its bearer. On general principles, the possibility exists, here too, that, under the covering of rationalistic interpretation and linguistic speculation, the kernel of form may be present, which gives us information about its origin and essence.⁴

As an example we may point to the series of evidences that cover the rite of *oscillatio*.⁵ Everything suggests that the explanations given of this subject, not only in their recorded form, but also in their origin, are relatively late; not one of them goes farther back than the age of Varro. The etymology of the word *oscillum* and a number of archaeological monuments enable us to realize, that in this ritual we have to do with the hanging up of masks, especially in the cult of Liber-Dionysos. If we now compare the ancient evidence, it is only in isolated cases that the correct view is given. Beside it, we find other attempts at interpretation, that seem at first to lead in a different direction. But that an original conception was preserved in them is shown by the fact that the explanations of *oscillum* and *oscillatio*, however much they differ in detail, all in one way or another bring in the masks or, at least, hint at them. Here, then, from the first a fixed field was marked out, within which those explanations had to move.⁶

From a quite different direction arguments can be brought into action against Wissowa's views. Hitherto, the proof, that a single motif or a whole story was taken over from Greek legend into Roman, was taken to imply that we had to do with a late creation. At the root of this lay the idea that, before the days of a Livius Andronicus or an Ennius, Greek mythology was almost unknown to the Romans. But E. Fraenkel has shown in impressive style,⁷ that the free play that Plautus makes with the most varied mythological ideas is only intelligible on the assumption, that Greek legend was known from of old in Rome. 'Long before the time of Livius Andronicus, perhaps in some cases centuries before, on the Tiber, as elsewhere, the motley world of Greek fable, even if not represented as a consistent whole or embraced within the limits of single works of art, must yet have been familiar in its main features and in its most important figures.⁸ The linguistic form of many names of myth,⁹ as well as the manifold representations on works of minor art, attest the age at which the reception took place.¹⁰ We must, then, reckon with a possibility, that, so far as I can see, has never yet been seriously considered—the possibility that myth formed on Greek models may yet go back into early times—at least, into times very much earlier than those that have hitherto been considered.

To this must be added a further point. Fraenkel was already convinced that the Italian tradition must be brought in for comparison. Etruria and Campania are the home of grecizing craftsmanship; in general they were the great intermediaries for Greek goods. In many cases the names of Greek gods in Rome enable us to see that they must have passed through those countries before they found adoption in Latium. This means a complication of our picture in an important point. Together with the world of Greek myth, elements from Etruria and other districts in Italy may have been received; to them, not to Greek goods only, will Rome from of old have stood open. But, while our picture grows more complicated, we get on the other hand a valuable means of assistance. The parallel tradition of Italy gains indefinitely in importance; where the Roman tradition fails us, it comes in to help and to complete.

We know in Rome of an ancient pair of deities, Cacus and Caca.¹¹ Only the female partner possessed a cult in historical times. In the shrine of Caca a fire was kept ever burning; the Vestal Virgins, the guardians of the hearth-fire, made a sacrifice to her. Cacus, on the other hand, appears only in myth. He is the opponent of Hercules, from whom he steals the cattle of Geryoneus. He appears in the tradition as a monster, dwelling in the depths of the earth and spitting fire; he is actually described as the son of Volcanus. We should, therefore, be inclined to believe that Cacus was a true partner of that Caca who is revealed in fire and that in his descent from the fire-god another original feature has been preserved.

Modern research has given a different verdict.¹² It has regarded the legend as a late invention. It does not appear, we are told, before Virgil, and certainly does not go back any earlier than his age. It is only in him that Cacus appears as son of Vulcan; Virgil alone is certainly responsible for this descent; Virgil alone has armed him with a fiery breath, as if to prove his origin.

In a case like this we see to perfection the limitations of a view that depends *solely* on the methodical criticism of sources. This view, it is true, only permits us to follow the legend back to the Augustan age. But the moment that we adduce for comparison the history of Italian proper names the result is altered. From this point of view, from the Etruscan, that is to say, the name of *Cacus* is identical with that of *Caeculus* the founder of Praeneste and heroic ancestor of the *gens Caecilia*.¹³ Caeculus, however, is described by Cato and by the city chronicle of Praeneste as a son of Vulcan. We must not be in such a hurry then to make up our minds. It is unquestionably possible, it is, in fact, extremely probable, that Virgil, in describing the descent of Cacus, has preserved an ancient trait.

The adventure of Cacus is not merely connected both in time and in content with the fight against Geryoneus, it is copied directly from it.¹⁴ The copy, however, comprises traits, which distinguish it from the original. In both cases they are creatures of the depths of earth,¹⁵ with whom Hercules measures forces, only that Geryoneus dwells in

the distant 'red-land', Erytheia, whilst Cacus has his seat, not in the realm of legend, but on the Aventine, the site of the earliest Rome. Here he steals the cattle of the passer-by by night, without respecting the sacredness of the stranger and the rights of hospitality. This adventure, then, does not develop into an open fight, as with Geryoneus, but into a struggle against trickery and deceit. It has been observed that the Romans, in contrast to other peoples, associated these qualities from the first with the idea of evil; *malitia* is the character of the *malus*, *perfidia* is the contrast to *fides*, which with *pietas* and *virtus* is the most Roman of the virtues.¹⁶ By the deed of Hercules, then, is established on Roman soil an order that henceforth holds good; a lawless monster is blotted out. A corresponding idea is not, indeed, foreign to the Greek myth, but in its new context it receives a new and individual meaning. The slaying of Cacus becomes an expression in picture of Rome's character and historical mission; the idea, *debellare superbos*, is here expressed on the plane of myth.

This conception seems at first to hold good only of the poem of Virgil. And yet that poem may have given shape to what was suggested, if only perhaps in hints, by the earlier myth. That the decisive trait, the lawless and criminal nature of Cacus, represents a traditional feature is proved, among other things, by the comparison with Caeculus of Praeneste.¹⁷ The native tradition, on which Servius draws (*Aen.* 7, 768), emphasizes, in his case too, the similar character, *latrocinari*. With this, our previous result finds confirmation; for the descent from the god of the earth-fire¹⁸ and the lawless nature of the monster are confirmatory of one another. We need only remind ourselves of Kerkyon, son of Hephaistos, or of the robber Periphatos with his club, who, like Cacus to Hercules, succumbed to Theseus.

From this side, too, we can no longer fail to recognize that we have before us a true and ancient legend. We must spend a moment in explaining the fundamental importance of this fact. The story of the adventure of Cacus is not only ancient, but it contains besides the foreign elements a true Roman part. The two, native and foreign, do not exclude one another, but combine to form a whole picture, impressive

in its unity. It is not the question as to whether Greek traits are or are not contained that must hold the central place, but rather the question whether a Roman form is present. The point of view, which has long since been familiar to literature, must no longer be withheld from legend. Here too we must make a clear break with the idea that the true Roman element is only to be looked for in a sphere, which has remained untouched by Greece.

We can do no more here than just refer to other legends, the age and original meaning of which have been revealed by the bringing in of Etruscan and ancient Italian traditions—for example, the appearance of the Dioscuri at the fountain of Juturna¹⁹ or the birth-legend of the kings, Romulus and Servius Tullius.²⁰ But we must emphasize in general the importance of the tradition of the origins of Rome and of the Roman kings, and of the myth of Aeneas.²¹ The legend of Romulus, above all, demands a new method of approach. Greek and Etruscan elements have entered here in peculiar fullness. But against the view that would speak of capricious invention and indiscriminate adoption of foreign motifs, let us remind ourselves of a saying of Ranke,²² that a tradition as magnificent and full of content as the ancient Roman is nowhere repeated in the history of the world. In its combination of historical recollection and political view it is ‘through and through Roman, indispensable for our understanding of Roman history’.

Our discussion up to now has been mainly concerned with general contexts and presuppositions; we must now illustrate the fruitfulness of our thought by a detailed example. This example is taken from the circle that we have already touched, the early mythical history of the Latin people. But we have here to deal, not with Roman kings, but with the series of those old kings of Laurentum (Janus, Saturnus, Picus, Faunus, Latinus), who counted in legend as the oldest rulers of Latium.

2. FAUNUS AND DAUNUS

The meaning of the name of the *luperci* is one of the most discussed problems in the history of Roman religion. It is the more urgent to settle it, as the understanding of the ritual of the *luper-*

calia and their chief rite, the running of the *luperci*, is dependent on it.

If we neglect, as we should do, the derivation of the word in Varro from *lupus* and *parcere* (in Arnobius 4, 3) or the reference to *lupus* and *hircus*,²³ attempts at explanation up to now may be divided into two classes. H. Jordan²⁴ was the first to maintain the view, that *lupercus* was merely a development by suffix from *lupus* and therefore corresponded to the relation of *novus*, *nova* to *noverca*. He has been followed in this by Th. Mommsen,²⁵ O. Gilbert,²⁶ W. Warde-Fowler²⁷ and W. F. Otto;²⁸ G. Wissowa, too, originally, made it his own.²⁹ L. Deubner,³⁰ on the other hand, went back to the ancient etymology, preserved in Servius, *Aen.* 8, 343, according to which *lupercus* is to be broken up into *lupus* and *arcere*, so that the meaning of the priesthood was 'averters of the wolf'. He succeeded in converting Wissowa³¹ from his earlier view; A. Walde³² and, finally, Marbach³³ have followed him.

We cannot here again discuss the arguments that may be brought into play for and against these two views. But we would deal with an observation, which has not yet been valued at its true worth. It seems as if it might give us the point of approach, from which this question, that has so often been championed with brilliant arguments, may finally be settled.

Not only did the priests of Faunus bear the name *luperci*, the god himself is said to have been called *Lupercus* (Justin. 43, 1, 7). Like *Fauna* beside *Faunus*, so too appears a *Luperca* beside her male partner; she was interpreted as the she-wolf, that suckled Romulus and Remus (Varro in Arnobius 4, 3; cp. Lactantius, *Inst. Christ.* 1, 20, 1). Wissowa, indeed, denied³⁴ the original quality of this goddess, as the name might only have been developed from the *luperci* and *Lupercalia*. Fowler³⁵ and Deubner³⁶ expressed the same judgement, while Otto³⁷ held to the ancient tradition. The question entered on a new phase when A. v. Blumenthal undertook to prove that the word *Faunus* itself is to be interpreted as 'wolf'.³⁸ This interpretation, if it could be confirmed, would be of decisive importance. If *Faunus* is the wolf, his priests, the *luperci*, can no longer be conceived of as averters of the wolf. The alternative view gains in weight, the view according to which they, like the Greek *ἄρκτοι, τάρχοι* &c., were themselves wolves and copies of their god.³⁹ No one will endeavour to-day to raise any doubts about the original character of *Lupercus* and his identity with Faunus.

A. v. Blumenthal began with the gloss in Hesychius, *θῆλον, θηλον*, and equated them, as is entirely permissible by linguistic law, with the Latin *Faunus*. Faunus himself, in that case, would have been a *θηλον*. v. Blumenthal went on, quite logically, to remind us of the interpretation of the *luperci* as wolves and of the corresponding nature of Faunus, as it had already been main-

tained by Otto.⁴⁰ The name of the god, then, was understood as meaning 'wolf'.

My object here is to carry this decisive observation a stage farther. I have been led to do so by the reflection that a gloss in Hesychius is perhaps rather a narrow basis for a conclusion of such decisive importance. I further reflected that v. Blumenthal took as his starting-point that rendering of *luperci* as wolves, which is for the time under debate, in order to prove for *θαῦρον* and *Faunus* this special meaning, as against the more general one of *θηρίον*. A really decisive proof, that the name of the god must mean 'wolf', is still to be given.

Before we set about establishing this proof on a broader basis than before, we must first discuss the earlier interpretations of the name. We all know the etymology, which connects *Faunus* with *faveo* and the west wind, *Favonius*.⁴¹ This connexion seems to have the more in its favour, inasmuch as it was thought that *Favonius* in nature as in name could be compared to *Faunus*. He would be the quickening wind, which blows in spring and brings with him the souls of the dead. In this he would correspond to the double nature of the Lupercalia, which not only contained a ritual of fertilization, but also served to avert mischief threatening from the side of the dead.⁴² Against this, we should remind ourselves that the connexion of *Favonius* with the dead, which is the decisive point, is nowhere recorded, but remains a mere possibility. One could face this possibility with favour, so long as one regarded a linguistic connexion of *Faunus* and *Favonius* as a certain datum. But it loses its power to convince, the moment that objections have to be raised against the linguistic combination.

The sound-group *-ov-*, which remained under stress, changed with the accent following to *-av-*.⁴³ Thus, *favissa* belongs to *fovea*, *cavere* to *κοῖν*, *favilla* to *foveo*, which seems to be preserved in the form *fove* (CIL. 1², 2, 573)⁴⁴ and in Umbrian *fons*, genitive *foner*, 'favens' 'faustus'. *Foveo* and *faveo* would, on this showing, have developed into two independent paradigms.

If we regard the two names from this point of view, *Faōnīus* from **Fovōnīos* is the correct linguistic form,⁴⁵ whilst in the case of **Fōvenos* we should expect, not *Faunus*, but **Founos*, **Fūnus*.⁴⁶ If we would still maintain the connexion with *faveo*, we must assume a formation by analogy. Such a formation cannot, of course, be excluded on general principles, but it involves a difficulty, which would tend to recommend an interpretation, that could dispense with such an assumption.

Faunus and *θαῦρον*, as v. Blumenthal has seen, imply an older **dhauno-*, which itself might be understood as a *-no-* formation from a root **dhav-*. This root⁴⁷ is present in Slavonic *daviti*, 'throttle', 'choke', Lydian *Κανθαύλης κινάγλης*, as name of *Hermes* ('throttler of dogs'),⁴⁸ and Gothic *af-dau-iþs*, *ἐκφυλμένος*, Matth. 9, 36. In view of this basic meaning we might think of

the *Fauni* as demons of nightmare and as *incubi*; ⁴⁹ Faunus himself would be the 'choker' or 'throttler'. How far this character of the god as *incubus* is connected with his wolfish nature would deserve a study by itself. It could, however, only be carried out in a wide field, and we are for the present relieved of the necessity for it, as the meaning, not only of 'throttler' simply, but of 'wolf' in particular, can be demonstrated with sufficient certainty.

From the root **dhav-* is derived first the Phrygian name of the wolf, which Hesychius gives as *δαός* (from **δαφός*).⁵⁰ Greek *θώς*, *θωός* (from **θωφός*), 'Jackel' has been set beside it.⁵¹ The same must hold good of the Thessalian Zeus *Θαύλιος*, a name which we should be loth to separate from the second element in *Κανθαύλης*.⁵² He too need not only have been a 'throttler' Zeus, but also a Zeus Lykeios or something similar; Kretschmer has devoted a special study to the wolf-god in his various designations,⁵³ and to this we shall have often to refer. Here, then, stand side by side two distinct noun-formations from the same root **dhav-*, and in their company **dhav-no* too must be enrolled. The further assumption is now easy, that, if *Faunus* and *θαῖνον* were a wild-beast (*θηρὸν*), we should recognize in them the wolf in particular. That the jackal (like the dog)⁵⁴ is connected with the wolf need hardly be emphasized; we need only remember that St. Jerome translates the 'howling' jackals in Jeremiah 50, 89 by *fauni* (*ficarii*).⁵⁵ This would fit well into this context.

The description of the wolf as the 'choker' ⁵⁶—by the side of *lupus* and *lupercus*—requires a few more words of explanation. It belongs to that great circle of roundabout descriptions, which often occur in the names of animals; A. Meillet ⁵⁷ has discussed it in a well-known article. Examples from the world of German fable are ready to hand. A striking parallel is supplied by the German name for the wolf himself.⁵⁸ Gothic *gawargeins* and *gawargjan*, *lauwa-wargs* and *wargiþa* seem to presuppose a lost **warguz*, which is connected with Old Isl. *vargr*, 'wolf, robber, evil-doer', Old Engl. *wearz*, Old Germ., Old Sax. *warg*, 'criminal'.⁵⁹ By the side of Germanic **wargaz*, stands the unattested verb **wërgan*, *warg*, *wurgum*, from which Germ. *würgen* (and **wurģjan*) is a derivation. The same Indo-Germanic root (**vergh-*) is present in Greek *ἐργατος*, *φραγμός* (Hesychius), *ἐργατῶν*, *ἄεργατος*, in Lithuanian, *veržiti*, 'hedge in', 'press', Old Slav. *vrzъ* 'bind', and other words.⁶⁰ The German world, then seems to have described the wolf as the 'choker'; that the same word should be used to denote the criminal, the reject from human society,⁶¹ corresponds to a common conception, into which we shall soon have to enter.

A final completion to our argument is supplied by Illyrian. In its various dialects (if we neglect Venetic, which in other respects as well takes a position of its own), Indo-Germanic aspirate media initially become media.⁶² For the change from *bh* to *b*, from

gh to *g*, evidence is present in Old Illyrian, but not for the change from *dh* to *d*. But both the analogy of the first two cases and the agreement with Albanian must convince us, that we should assume a similar transition for the dentals too. We should have an actual piece of evidence, if the Illyrian place-name *Candavia*⁶³ is rightly connected with the root **dhav-*.⁶⁴ We must remember that the first element is also present in Illyrian *Káv-iva*, *Kav-vóiov*, *Canusium*,⁶⁵ further, that the Albanian word for the dog, *ken*, *ken*, is traced back to the Latin *canis*⁶⁶ and *Candavia* may be explained just like Lydian *Kav-δαύλης*. Whether the name of the place is actually connected with Hermes, 'who chokes dogs', may be left undecided here; for the meaning we might also adduce the name in the Middle Ages, *Pendelupum*, which I chanced to find in A. Darmesteter.⁶⁷ We can dispense with parallels from the names of places in more modern times, since in its composition at least the Illyrian word should already be clear. With this, we should have, not only a proof of the change in Old Illyrian from *dh* to *d*, but also one for the appearance of the root **dhav-*.

There is a second case, in which this root seems to occur, in the name of *Daunus* or *Δαῦνος*, the early legendary king of the Apulian Illyrians. Like *Faunus* and *θαῦνον*, it might be traced back to an earlier **dhauno-*. In that case, we should have to see in it again the 'throttler', that is to say, the wolf. It can be no accident, then, that Daunus was the eldest son of Lykaon (Nicander in Antonin. Lib. 31). He, too, bears the wolf in his name and cannot be separated from the *Λυκαόνες*, in whom P. Kretschmer⁶⁸ has recognized the 'worshippers of the wolf-god'.

We have already mentioned, that the wolf from of old was the animal of the stranger, the exile, the reject from his native realm. References to Germanic conceptions have been given above: the same phenomenon recurs in the religions of Greece and Italy.⁶⁹ Daunus is said to have migrated from his Illyrian home to Italy in connexion with certain quarrels (Paul. Fest. p. 69 M.; cp. Nicander, loc. cit.); he was a true wolf, then. When Diomedes, banished from Argos, went to the Italian West⁷⁰ and found a welcome with this wolf, that is only another way of saying that he went into foreign parts. And if this same Diomedes, in an isolated tradition (Schol. Lycophron 592), found his end in struggle against Daunus, this again would suit the 'wolf' very well.⁷¹

It seems as if within the same circle of legend the same conception is preserved yet, a second time. When Diomedes came to Italy, he is said to have supported Daunus against the Messapians and to have received as thanks a part of his kingdom and with it the hand of his daughter (Antonin. Lib. 37; Ovid, *Met.* 14, 457 f.; 510 f.; *Fasti* 4, 76; Pliny, *n. h.* 3, 103). Now, we find the story, in a somewhat dubious tradition, it is true (Pseudo-Plutarch, *Parall. min.* 23), that the king of Libya, Lykos, wanted to sacrifice to his father Ares the Diomedes who was driven to

his shores, but that the daughter of the king was smitten by love of the stranger and saved his life. Here we find again the essential motifs; the landing on a foreign shore, the reception by the wolf, the connexion with the daughter of the king. We must also remember that, often as here, Ares is combined in various ways with the wolf.⁷² So too, the Faunus who corresponds to Daunus, stood in close connexion with the wolf-god, Mars, and even appears as his son (Dionys. Hal. 1, 31, 2; cp. Appian, *bas. fr.* 1).⁷³

The legend of Lykos, on the authority of its teller, comes from the *Λύκος* of Juba. The attempt has lately been made to see in it an imitation of the legend of Theseus and Ariadne.⁷⁴ But we shall have now to be more careful. It can no longer be mistaken that a parallel version to the legend of Daunus and Diomedes is before us.

Daunus appears, not only in Apulia, but also in Latium,⁷⁵ and so in the immediate neighbourhood of the Roman god. He is there the king of Ardea, father of Turnus, at least in the tradition that we find in Virgil. The city itself is said to have been founded by Danae, who with Perseus in his cradle reached the Latin coast and married Pylum there (Virgil, *Aen.* 7, 371 f. and Servius 410; Pliny, *n. h.* 3, 56). Daunus and Turnus, therefore, were descendants of the royal house of Argos. It is remarkable that the wolf was the badge of Argos and that the Argives from it were designated as wolves (Aeschylus, *Hicet.*, 760).⁷⁶ The king, Danaos, who came from abroad to what was later to be his kingdom, appears, correspondingly, in legend as a thieving wolf, forcing his way in from outside.⁷⁷ If the Argives called themselves after him Danaans (Paus. 7, 1, 7; Strabo p. 221; 371; Steph. Byz. *Ἀργός*) it was only right that they should regard themselves as wolves. To find Daunus the 'wolf' as the descendant of the Argive kings should no longer surprise us.

It is most remarkable that a direct line of connexion can be drawn from the Daunus of Ardea to Faunus. In the legend of Aeneas Daunus is confronted with Latinus, king of Laurentum, and that reminds us that Faunus too is connected with him. In the series of the kings of Laurentum, Latinus is the son of Faunus, or again the son of his former wife or of his daughter with Hercules.⁷⁸ The idea forces itself on us; may Faunus not only in name, but also as a figure of myth, be identical with Daunus?

Ardea is not only the seat of Daunus, it is also a centre of the worship of Faunus. In the Ardean territory lies the *castrum Inui*, called after the god Inuus; he was similar to Faunus, perhaps identical with him.⁷⁹ The Rutulians, the inhabitants of Ardea, are called in Silius Italicus, *Punica* 8, 356, *Faunigenae*; among the companions of Turnus appears a Tarquitiu, son of Faunus (Virgil, *Aen.* 10, 550 f.). In the duel between Aeneas and Turnus a *sacer Fauno foliis oleander amaris* plays a part (Virgil, *Aen.* 12, 766 f.). Here those who had escaped the sea hung up their clothes

Laurenti dīvo, that is, to the deified king of Laurentum, Faunus; to him Turnus, in his bitterest need, directs his appeal (776 f.).

In Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1, 48, 1 appears a daughter of Evander, who is called *Λαῦνα* and was the beloved of Hercules; he gave her in marriage to the king of the Aborigines, Faunus. Scholars have wished to see in her Fauna, a female consort, and, in point of fact, there is much to recommend this theory.⁸⁰ But, on grounds of palaeography, the form *Λαῦνα* is much more probable; in that case, there would be a Dauna standing beside Faunus, just as he stands beside the male Daunus. That we should take this view is proved by Dionys. Halic. 1, 82, 1, where this figure is named a second time, on the authority of Polybius. The reading here is *Λύνας τῆς Εὐδάνδρου θυγατρὸς*. This, I think, should be restored as *Λαύνας*. The two variants of the manuscript tradition, taken together, force us to accept this form.

At this stage, we return to the *luperci* and the god, Lupercus, who formed the starting-point of our discussion. Now that we have explained Faunus himself as a wolf, we shall be inclined to understand in the same sense both the god, who is identical with Faunus, and his priests. But there is one argument that disinclines us to equate *Lupercus* at once with 'wolf'. The word is an adjectival formation from *lupus*, and it is natural, therefore, to regard it as a description of the 'wolfish', that is to say, of that which belongs to a wolf. As such it would join a wide circle of similar names.

A single example will make this clear. We have the Thracian *Δαῖοι* or *Δᾶνι*, who were undoubtedly wolves.⁸¹ But beside them stand the *Δᾶ-κί*, and their name is formed like the *luperci* with an adjectival suffix. There is some hesitation, then, between a description that at once identifies the community with wolves and another that only makes them connected with them. Very instructive in this context are a number of Italian names, which lead us into the immediate neighbourhood of Faunus. In the first place, we have to mention the Apulian Daunians, who traced back their descent to Daunus. They were 'those who belong to the wolf', or, if we base ourselves on the patronymic value of the *-io-* suffixes,⁸² 'the sons of the wolf'. We may also compare the *Hirpini*, called after the wolf of Mars,⁸³ just as the Picentines were called after another sacred creature, the woodpecker (*picus*). But the 'young woodpeckers'⁸⁴ were certainly themselves woodpeckers, whilst the *Hirpini* were not wolves themselves, but only connected with the wolf-god.

Finally, we may mention the *hirpi Sorani*, the priests of the god of Soracte;⁸⁵ W. F. Otto⁸⁶ has already adduced them in this context.⁸⁷ They themselves are wolves, as we are expressly told (Servius, *Aen.* 11, 785; cp. Paul. Fest. p. 106 M.; Strabo 5, p. 250), and, if we remember the wolfish shape of the Etruscan god of death,⁸⁸ there can be no doubt that the priests are identical with

the god. But the tradition about their name is not a single one. Pliny, *n. h.* 7, 19, and Solinus (2, 26), who draws on him, speak only of *hirpi*, but in Servius, *Aen.* 11, 785, Soracte is called the mountain of the *hirpini*; we are further told that its inhabitants were called *hirpi Sorani* (*hirpini* F) *quasi lupi Ditis patris*, and Virgil compared Arruns to a wolf, *quasi hirpinum Soranum*. That this form is no oversight is shown by the quotation from Varro, made by Servius on line 787. Again the description as *hirpini* appears; one can find no good reason for altering it, with Salmasius, into *hirpi*. We must admit, then, the adjectival form as existing in its own right beside the *hirpi*, that is recorded in other places. Here again 'wolves' appear by the side of those, whose name shows no more than connexion with the god **Hirpus*, that is, with the wolf-god of Soracte. We must conceive of the *luperci* in a similar way.

We have still to speak of the god, Lupercus. That he does not simply mean the wolf, might seem to suggest an objection to our earlier results. He might not be merely identical with the 'wolf', Faunus, and be named simply because of connexion with him. But we should remember that Roman deities in other cases bear names of adjectival form. The river-god is named, not *Tiberis*, but always *Tiberinus*; ⁸⁹ and so, too, the god *Portunus* was not simply named after the harbour (*portus*), but after his connexion with it. Most important are the *Haunii* = *dii agrestes* (lib. gloss), whom no one will wish to separate from Faunus and the *Fauni*; with them again we have to do with an adjectival formation.

In the designation of the god himself, then, too, appears a hesitation between the wolf himself and the one, who is merely named after his connexion with or relation to that animal. We should feel no surprise at it, for it is really what we ought to expect. For very early thought representation in animal and in human form are by no means mutually exclusive. Just as in primitive belief man and beast, man and plant are, to use the expression of L. Levy-Brühl, 'inwardly interchangeable', so is the same true of mythical and divine beings. 'Even in historical religions, wherever in cult or in saga something of the early or very early period is preserved, we find this flexibility of conception, in contrast to which our way of thought, that is disciplined by the will to control nature, makes a stiff and mechanical impression. The divine river is this concrete water, which I see flowing by me, hear rippling and can scoop up with my hand; but it is at the same time a bull and, more than that, a creature in human shape, just as the primitive group consists of men, who can also be eagles or the like'. I have quoted these words of W. F. Otto,⁹⁰ because I seem to find in them the decisive idea expressed. That we have to explain in some such way as this the mixed formations, half-animal, that are characteristic of the earliest representations of gods, has already been indicated by Otto himself.⁹¹ So, too, in

our particular case, the representation of the wolf-god in Etruscan art runs through the most various stages, extending from a complete identification with the wolf, to a half-animal form or even to a mere indication, such as the wearing of a wolfskin-cap.⁹² Into this scheme the picture suggested by language perfectly fits. The description of the god by his mere relation to the wolf, leaving the particular character of the connexion vague, stands beside another, in which animal and god are at once identified.

We have now, it seems, found out the meaning of the name of the god, Lupercus. In his case again the method of thought that we have been practising has seemed to find confirmation. Decisive, finally, is the comparison of the legends, which have been attached to the figures of Faunus and Daunus. They show so early and close a relationship, that any lingering doubts about their identity must vanish.

The figure of the Apulian Daunus shows a curious vacillation. At one time, he welcomes Diomedes and gives him his daughter in marriage; at another, he appears as a hostile power. In Daunia, Diomedes is said to have been killed or even to have met his death at the hand of Daunus. To the primitive Messapian king corresponds in Latium Daunus of Ardea; beside him stands the Laurentine king, Faunus. With them, too, appears a Homeric hero as immigrant, this time one of the opposite faction, Aeneas. According to the tradition represented in Appian, *bas.* 1, 2, he was kindly welcomed by King Faunus of Lavinium. Against this, we have the version of Virgil, in which it was Latinus, with whom the Trojans found welcome, whilst Turnus—and, as we must suppose, Daunus, too—took up a position of hostility against them. Again, we find hesitation between two contradictory versions. And here a new piece of evidence of great importance may be added.

At the close of the *Theogony* of Hesiod, Agrios and Latinus are named as sons of Odysseus and Circe (1011 f.). Of them we hear that they

μάλα τῆλε μυχῷ νησῶν ἰεράων
πᾶσι Τυρρηνοῖσιν ἀγακλείτοισιν ἄνασσον.

The verse points, as has been seen, to Latium and presupposes the localization of Circe in Circei. When the Tyrrhenians are called the people of Latinus, that reflects in the sphere of myth the Etruscan lordship over Latium. Of Agrios it has been supposed that the name is invented, and simply means that the foreign sailors found no kindly reception at this spot.⁹³ But must it necessarily have been fiction? Daunus and his race were, it appears, enemies of Aeneas and his companions; if so, Agrios might be merely another name of the king of Ardea. This is the more possible, inasmuch as he really did rule over Etruscans. For the Rutulians are, in Appian, *bas.* fr. 1, 2, described as *Ρούτυλοι*

of *Τυρρηνός*.⁹⁴ That the name of the son of Daunus, Turnus, means nothing but the Etruscan. (**Turs-nos*) has long since been recognized; ⁹⁵ Dionys. Hal. 1, 64, 2 f., translates it directly as *Τυρσηνός*. Finally, it was from Ardea that the Dioscuri and their consort, the goddess Juturna, came to Rome; in the half-Etruscan names of these deities an indication of the Etruscan nationality of the people of Ardea is preserved.⁹⁶

A son of Circe and Odysseus Daunus, it is true, was not. Here we must bring in his double, the Latin Faunus; he completes the picture that has been appearing before us. In the epic of Nonnos there appears on various occasions a *Φαῦνος*, whose identity with the Roman god stands above question. In *Dionys.* 13, 328 f., he is described as son of Circe and Zeus, and in 37, 56 f., he is described as *φιλοσκοπέλοιω δὲ Κίρκης Φαῦνος ἐρημονόμος, Τυρσηνίδος ἀσπὸς ἀρούρης*. Like Agrios, then, he is a 'Tyrrhenian'. He is also called *ἐρημονόμος*, and his mother, a little while before, is called *ἀγροτέρα*,—both descriptions echo the meaning of *ἄγριος*; he denotes then the one who lives *κατ' ἀγρούς*.

For Faunus, then, it seems that we can observe an agreement with the Agrios of Hesiod. The evidence of Nonnos, that we have adduced, is indeed late and one might at first assume that Nonnos merely drew what he knew from Hesiod. But the paternity of Zeus makes this impossible; we have an independent account, even if we cannot say to what source it goes back.⁹⁷ It will hardly do to pass it by as insignificant; rather must we admit that a figure, identical in essentials with Agrios, is here called Faunus. In this case, the god in Hesiod would be characterized as the 'wild', just like the closely kindred Mars, who was already invoked in the song of the Arval Brethren as *fere Mars*.

That this identification of Faunus and Agrios has hit the mark is shown, on a closer view, by several other considerations. *Ἄγριος*, at least in his original significance, agrees with the *silvicola Faunus*⁹⁸ and his activity in the mysterious 'outside' world.⁹⁹ He actually has the name *agrestis* (Ovid, *Fast.* 2, 193; cp. Virgil, *Georg.* 1, 10); the peasants imagine that they have seen him *in agris* (Probus, *Georg.* 1, 10).¹⁰⁰ The *Haunii* as *dii agrestes* (lib. gloss.) have already been mentioned; we may also recall *Ἀγρότης* as epithet of Pan,¹⁰¹ with whom Faunus was later equated. Finally, we must remember Oiairos, who usually appears as father of Orpheus. He 'who lives alone in the country'¹⁰² cannot be separated either from the *Φαῦνος ἐρημονόμος* of Nonnos or from Agrios. It can hardly be an accident, then, that, just as Faunus belongs to the circle of Mars, so too Oiairos once appears as the son of Arcs (Nonn., *Dionys.* 13, 428).

But *Ἄγριος*, the 'savage', too finds his parallels. *Τὰ ἄγρια*, Il. 5, 52, are the wild animals, the 'wild'. *Ἄγριος* is the name of a centaur, who with others falls upon Heracles in the cave of Pholos (Apollodor. 2, 5, 4, 4), of a *θήρ*, then.¹⁰³ Similarly,

the Oïagros, whom we have just mentioned, is father of a creature of horse-shape, Marsyas (Hygin., *Fab.* 165). One of the hounds of Actaion is called, in Hyginus, *Fab.* 181, *Agrius*: in Ovid, *Met.* 2, 212, *Agre*.¹⁰⁴ All this would fit in very well with the animal nature of Faunus, especially with the 'wolf' in him.

We close with one last consideration. Like Agrios, Faunus is a primitive king of Latium.¹⁰⁵ In this he again makes contact with his double, Daunus, and we may point out in this context that he is not alone in bearing an Illyrian name. The same is true of the figure of Odysseus, who in Hesiod is father of Agrios. The Latin form of the name, *Ulixes*, proves by its vocalization that it did not reach central Italy by way of the epic, but probably through the Messapians, certainly through Illyrian peoples.¹⁰⁶

Müllenhoff¹⁰⁷ and Preller¹⁰⁸ have already identified Agrios with Faunus, and a fresh study has only confirmed their results. This is of remarkable importance for the history of Roman legend. The tales of the primitive kings of Latium count, like so many others, as late and valueless products of Hellenizing savants, whose activity belongs to the close of the Republic.¹⁰⁹ But now we see that two of these primitive kings—and in that very capacity—already appear in the concluding passage of the *Theogony* of Hesiod. This passage may be placed with certainty not later than the sixth century.¹¹⁰ At least equally early must we now set the origin of Latin legend.

It is remarkable that the figure of the primitive Apulian king, Daunus, who has so far always revealed himself as the counterpart of Faunus, shows an agreement with him in point of chronology too. The legend of the Italian voyage of Diomedes and his reception in the West goes back, as has long since been seen, to the same sixth century, or even into the second half of the seventh.¹¹¹

The true home of Daunus was Messapian Apulia, even as the true home of Faunus was Latium. It is only in the epic of Virgil that the primitive Messapian king appears in Ardea. It may seem natural, then, to see in this an innovation of the poet. But against this would go the suggestion, that we have already made, according to which a *Δαῖνα* appears as daughter of the Roman Evander as early as Polybius.¹¹² Further, the contacts between the figures of Daunus and Faunus are so extensive, that they must have been felt to be directly identical. Where the decisive conception was first realized, or whether the two figures were created contemporaneously at two places, cannot now be decided. But the agreements that exist can only be understood if we presume a close and lasting contact of Latium with the Illyrians of Italy. But then we must reckon with the possibility that they brought the name of Daunus to Ardea in very early times.

The part played by this people in ancient Italy was too lightly appraised by the older generation of scholars. Illyrian tribes were settled, not only south-east of the Euganean Hills and in

Apulia, but also along the whole of the east coast.¹¹³ W. Schulze¹¹⁴ and P. Kretschmer¹¹⁵ have succeeded in demonstrating an Illyrian stratum in the interior. On the tables of Iguvium appears the *Iapuzkum numen*, as also the Mars **Grabovius*, the 'oak-god', who came to the Umbrians through the mediation of Illyrian peoples.¹¹⁶ Livorno got its name from the Liburnians;¹¹⁷ in Falerii the Illyrian Messapus has his seat, who once again is identical with the legendary king of Privernum, Metabus.¹¹⁸ H. Krahe has brought together other examples and tried to derive the name of Ardea from that of the Illyrian **Arđaior* and the fort **Arđela*.¹¹⁹ The appearance of an Illyrian hero, then, at the same place should no longer surprise us.

Book III

THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

IT was the aim of our narrative from the first to arrive at an understanding of religious history in its strict sense, as a component part of general history. This involved a certain restriction of our field of vision, in so far as the question of the nature of religion was bound to take a secondary place, behind that of its development. Yet it is this very setting in history that led us on the other hand beyond any too closely marked boundaries. Instead of a consideration, limited in place, came the attempt to comprehend the special instance as part of a more inclusive development. At a very early date we were able to observe on the Apennine peninsula the beginnings of the formation of an historical and cultural unity. By the side of the separate cultures, distinct in language and race, the tendency to form a general culture in ancient Italy becomes evident. It not only embraces the Italian peoples proper (including the Etruscans and the Illyrians), but the Greek element, too, has from the beginning been a formative element in it. From this resulted the conclusion that even in early times what is Greek and what is Italian cannot be separated as a matter of general principle. The specifically Italian element must be sought, then, less in a period of absence of contact with the sister-culture, less in special contents at all, than in the form that was given on native initiative to the borrowed goods.

Rome of the earliest period means no more than one member (and, at first, not a very active member) of this whole. The history of language and the finds as well show that it cannot be understood without a glance at the general development of Italy. As we might expect, then, the influence of Greece is to be traced at a very early date. It is revealed

most palpably in religion. The oldest stratum of cults of the state contains, beside the native gods, a whole series of Greek.

The history of religion thus obtains an importance that goes beyond its own sphere. It is not unusual for religious belief to preserve traces of old, in fact, primitive conditions. In our case we can read from it the fundamental position of the culture of early Rome and early Italy as a whole. We are able to observe the process which here for the first time was enacted and which thereafter was destined to be of incomparable importance for the history of Europe (as cultural idea)—the conflict between the special national values of the single people and the Greek culture that was adopted as a norm, surpassing nation and history.

In Italy and Rome this conflict was fought out in different stages. It extends from a simple borrowing at the outset to a conscious penetration and complete remodelling of the foreign loan. In the course of this process is revealed that characteristic of Greek culture, that has been confirmed by all subsequent history, its power to awaken the special forces of each people by whom it is adopted, and lead them to take shapes of their own. This is the reason why the early age of Greek influence and the early existence of a general Italian culture are indissolubly connected. The two correspond, not only in the outward coincidence of time, but also in their inward nature. The appearance of that culture only became possible at all through the ferment of Greece. The correctness of these general ideas must now be shown again in the periods that follow the earliest. Our new conception of a general culture of ancient Italy will again have to prove its usefulness for the understanding of the earliest development of Rome. But it is of even greater importance to observe the active and formative power of Greece in its various modes of expression. A few remarks may pave the way for what is to follow.

If it was the contact with Greece that first liberated the native forces of Italy to find their true shape, a fresh conclusion forces itself on us. Within the realms of Italy and Rome there must have been a new orientation of the native cultural position to correspond to the changed attitude towards

Greece. From the historical development, to which the relation to Greece was subjected, we can read the history of the native culture. Or, to put it in other words, if we can succeed in understanding the adoption of the Greek element as an intelligible process and in demonstrating an inward progress in the conception, the arrangement and the shaping of what was borrowed, then the rhythm and disposition of this process in time will give us the frame for the whole development of Italo-Roman culture, the history of religion included.

Within a classification of this kind, the division into epochs that it implies must at once attain a considerable importance. It does not merely give a practical assistance for classifying the course of events and enabling us to see it as a whole, but it is so related to any particular idea, that to each historical period must correspond a stage in the gradual unfolding of that idea. The course of history in time would, then, have its counterpart in a world of system that lies above history; the development of the rhythm could be represented in a timeless sphere as an order, in the several stages of which the full content of the idea is developed.

For the moment we are giving expression to a possibility and no more. The fruitfulness of the thought will have to prove itself on the facts.

Chapter II

THE RESHAPING OF CULT

FOR Sicily and Greek South Italy the end of the sixth and the beginning of the following century mark an age of heightened activity in building. This was especially expressed in sacred architecture. Not only Agrigentum and Syracuse, but also Selinus and the whole circle of cities of Magna Graecia adorn themselves with new shrines. The temples of Paestum, the 'Tavole Palatine' of Metapontum, the column at Lacinium, have outlasted the centuries as speaking witnesses to the fact. More has come to light in the excavations that are for ever linked to the name of P. Orsi and his fellow-workers; among other things, a plastic art, which, in contrast to the mother country, prefers earthenware even for monumental tasks.

The relation to this of the appearance of a sacred architecture in central Italy is at once realized, both in point of time and of nature.¹ The first Etruscan temples, whether in the homeland or in Latium and Campania, arose at that period, and that there was no lack of attempts at creation on the monumental scale will soon be seen. Plastic art on the grand scale in earthenware has its counterpart in the works of the school of Veii.

The relation can be drawn even closer, if we extend our field of vision to include the whole of the Greek world.

The beginning of the sixth century is marked by a series of political events of high significance. Within these years falls the rule of Cleisthenes of Sicyon, the law-giving of Solon, the reign of Croesus. Soon afterwards Pisistratus in Athens seizes the government of the state; in Naxos Lygdamis, in Samos Polycrates comes to power. For the first time, under the form of the tyranny, the great individual rises to decisive importance. The movement passes

over to the West as well. Phalaris, it is true, remains an isolated, almost mythical phenomenon, and Aristodemus of Cyme, too, is no longer realizable for us. But after the turn of the century the Sicilian tyranny reaches its climax in Gelo and Hiero.

The sense of individual worth in the ruler went, from the first, hand in hand with a passion for building on the grand scale. That trait in the new families of rulers that turned towards pomp and magnificence learned also to stamp itself on monumental architecture. In Samos rises the marvellous Heraeum; in Athens arose under the Pisistratids the archaic buildings of the Acropolis with all their ornamentation of statuary and their countless offerings. The opponents of the reigning house, the exiled Alemaeonidae, raised in Delphi the temple of Apollo, after its destruction by fire, in new brilliance.

Occasionally these endeavours extend beyond the purely artistic remodelling of the outward frame of cult. But the grandeur of the effort persists. After the other Panhellenic contests (Pythian, Isthmian and Nemean games) had, about 580 B.C., taken their place beside the old traditional Olympian games, Pisistratus a few years later founded the Panathenaea. They did not, it is true, succeed in winning a position outside Attica.

It is important that we can again draw the parallel to the conditions in central Italy and, above all, in Rome.² In the Tarquins of Etruria arises for the first time a ruling family that unites larger parts of Latium around one centre. Hand in hand with the growing political importance of Rome goes an extension of the city itself and a taste for the monumental in building. At the same time plastic art on the grand scale in earthenware finds its way in. Perhaps it was on the soil of Rome, too, that a statue of a girl stood, which reminds us of the Attic Korai of the age of Pisistratus no less than does the newly-discovered statue of South Etruscan origin that is now in Copenhagen.³

All these phenomena have found expression equally in religion. Again it is in the reshaping of cult that the new epoch sought and found its expression.

1. PRELIMINARY STAGES IN THE EARLIEST CULT

In an earlier passage we have already called to mind the close connexion between the earliest stratum in Rome and the pre-Homeric religion. From this circle came all those Greek deities that could be observed within the order of festivals of the original calendar. Here we must emphasize another factor that gives confirmation of the connexion. What I have in mind is the variation in the form in which divine powers appear. Beside their presence in the element itself and their taking of human shape, they can also appear as animals in form.

Immediate contact with the pre-Homeric religion exists in the shape of Ceres-Demeter. In the Italian sphere, too, the Earth-mother was conceived of by the faithful as a horse. In Falerii and in the Latin saga of Metabus and Camilla⁴ the agreement is evident; in Rome itself traces of it can be found.⁵ The god, Picus, again, who appears not only in Rome but also among the Aequi, the Picentines, and the Umbrians of Iguvium, and in all cases belongs to the circle of Mars, can represent nothing but the woodpecker. In Tiora Matiene he sat in that shape on a wooden pillar and prophesied (Dionys. Halic. 1, 14, 5); a woodpecker took up its position on the *vevillum* of the Sabines, who emigrated to Asculum (Paul. Fest. p. 212 M.; Strabo 5, p. 240; Silius Italicus 8, 439 f.).⁶ One inevitably arrives at the same conclusion about the outward form of the god as in the case of the companion of Picus, Faunus, who has been proved to have been a wolf.

In the appearance of the god in animal shape is revealed a close connexion of the world of religious conceptions with the realm of nature. This connexion is shown, not only in the shape of the gods, but also in the character and lie of their shrines. What we know of the original form of Roman shrines is little enough, but it is still sufficient to enable us to grasp the general facts of the case.

The main features were given by Nature herself. Here we may count the worship of the deity on heights, in sacred groves and grottoes, or the cult of holy springs and trees, which once formed the centre of a sacred precinct. Many of

the earliest places of cult preserved their original form through the changes of time, as, for example, the grotto of Faunus at the foot of the Palatine, or the groves of Juno Lucina and of the goddess Mefitis; they lay within the busy life of the world-city of later days as witnesses to the earlier practice of religion. Another grove, that of the Arval Brethren (near the Vigna Ceccarelli), has become familiar in our own times through the discovery of the Acts of the College, recorded on inscriptions. Pliny the Elder mentions a sacred oak-tree (*n. h.* 16, 237) which bore an inscription in Etruscan letters and thus attested the high age to which the religious veneration of that spot extended. From the shrine of Silvanus that still survives in the country, north-east of the acropolis of Terracina,⁷ we can to this day realize something of the appearance and feel of such a spot.

The art and poetry of the early Empire vied with one another in rendering in their creations the peculiar charm that flowed from such a site. A plain, fenced precinct with an altar, a pillar or a holy tree, decked with country offerings and garlands—these and similar motifs were countless times employed by Roman landscape-painting. The magic of the picture was felt by Ovid, too (*amor.* 3, 1, 1 f.);

*Stat vetus et multos incaedua silva per annos,
Credibilest illi numen inesse loco;
Fons sacer in medio speluncaque pumice pendens
Et latere ex omni dulce queruntur aves.*

This has justly been compared to the relief of the Villa Farnesina or the so-called Basilica before the Porta Maggiore, which give expression to the same mood. To the source of the Clitumnus Pliny the Younger devoted one of his finest descriptions (*ep.* 8, 8); it inspired a Carducci to some notable verscs. All this is familiar and needs only to be recalled to mind. It agrees with what has been observed of the earliest Greek cult, particularly of that of the pre-Homeric age.⁸

In contrast to this close connexion with nature, the classical idea of the gods in Greece ventured to place man, and man alone, in the centre of the picture. It saw him as so grand and so exalted that none other than he could in future avail for the picture of the godhead. It is nothing so naïve

as bringing down the divine into the human sphere, as the catchword 'anthropomorphism' implies; no, but in the godhead man recognized himself as a figure of eternity.⁹ With this came the decisive impulse to express the cult-image in human shape. And, as here man is raised on high and deified, so too is it with the Greek temple. 'In the column the natural man rears himself' (Wölfflin), and it is his house that in the cult-building is raised to the monumental plane. Even when such a building extends into vastness it does not go beyond the human, but simply raises it to its supreme grandeur and dignity.

Already in the pre-Homeric age men could see their gods in human form. It was precisely in such cases, when the new idea was in contact with something already in existence, something that was already, however impurely and imperfectly, guessed and dully felt, that its success is easiest to understand. This is true not only of Greece itself, but also, it seems, of the Italian West.

For Rome itself, however, we must at first reject such an idea. Like all the immigrants who came in over the Alps, the cremating Italians brought with them, as part of their Nordic inheritance, an abstract linear form of expression in art. The Villanova vessels of Falerii or of the Alban hills show this style, which is expressed in pictures primitive in their draughtsmanship. There are only the slightest suggestions of plastic art¹⁰ or of the representation of the human figure; they lag far behind what is known of the art of the Ligurians or the people of Novilara, of the Apulians or of Este. The best examples are supplied by the grave-urns, which as a whole imitate the human shape; on the sides of vessels, too, appear, either singly or in rows, figures like men. Small plastic works, in the form of idols, are rarely encountered, for example, in the cemetery of Vigna Cavaletti near Grottaferrata (now in the Museum Pigorini in Rome) or in the primitive bronze idols of the Viminal.¹¹ It was only after long sojourning in the south that that process of change was completed, that was to be typical of other northern peoples: the immigrants seize with avidity on the plastic shapes that they meet, and avail themselves of the forms that they find to their hand, to give shape to creations of their own.

It is quite in agreement with these facts that it has been maintained of the conception of deity in early Rome that it lacked corporeal realization and had that shadowy, abstract and incorporeal character which is significant of the earliest artistic expressions of the Roman people.¹² The claim seems just, and yet this very comparison should dispose us to formulate our view with more caution. Just as in art the representation of the human form does appear, however rarely, however imperfectly, however fettered to linear ornamentation, and just as it is only this that explains the readiness with which the perfect forms of a foreign art were assimilated, so or somewhat similarly must it have gone in the field of religion. There, too, perhaps, there existed no more than a first premonition, a first hesitating attempt, but it was enough to give a basis for a richer and more perfect expression. It has been said that marriages and genealogies of gods, 'that prime characteristic of an anthropomorphic conception of deity',¹³ were lacking. Rome, we were then assured, in this stood in contrast to her Latin neighbours. This is true enough, as far as the state of the Republican period is concerned. But that it was not always so is shown at once by the name of the Mater Larum, who can only be understood as the mother of those deities.¹⁴ There is further evidence in the name of Sol Indiges, which means simply 'Father of the race'.¹⁵ Descriptions like *Mars pater* or *Ops mater* must once really have meant what they say. The very names of the deities point to their being conceived either in male or female form. The same is true of the old forms of invocation, in which the deity is addressed with the formula *sive deus sive dea* or *sive mas sive femina*.¹⁶ At least as high as this stage of the realization of a divine being as man Roman religion seems to have climbed.

We find something to correspond to this in another quarter. The appearance of the god in human form has, as we have already emphasized, its counterpart when his shrine is no more rooted in the environment of nature, but in a house of the human kind.

In Greece the starting-point for the formation of the later temple was supplied by the secular building of prehistoric times. On the one hand stands the house in the form of an

oval or an apse, the latter best realizable in the history of the building of the temple of Apollo at Thermos. It goes back to an original ruler's house, which, at latest in the seventh century, was converted into a shrine. The Mycenaean Megaron, too, is obviously a predecessor; there, too, there is obvious connexion with later conditions. The Telesterion of Eleusis is erected above a Mycenaean Megaron with a 'peribolos'.¹⁷ In Tiryns the main hall of the former palace was claimed for a temple of Hera, and the altar that belonged to the Mycenaean court was restored and brought within the precincts of the cult.

This very example may make it plain where we have to look for the inducement to take over a secular building for purposes of cult. The king, the former possessor of the palace, was originally the bearer, perhaps the most important bearer, of sacred functions. The hearth of his house represented the place of public offerings, the altar of the god and of the community. With the decay of the kingly office the new community was bound, here as elsewhere, to step in as his successor. It continued the cult at the same spot to which it had from of old been linked. That is only conceivable on the assumption that the house of the king meant at the same time a house of the gods, who at his hearth received their sacrifices.

In Rome we may observe the same course of events in the taking over of the former house of the king, the Regia, by the state-cult.¹⁸ The *pontifices*, who carried on the sacred obligations of the former ruler, received it as their central office. At the same time, the building, in part at least, became a place of cult, in which all manner of sacred gear was kept and in which a series of sacrifices were performed; in many cases these seem to reflect ancient cults of the royal house.¹⁹

The architectural structure of the Regia, as it has been revealed by the excavations on the forum, corresponds entirely to that of cult.²⁰ The ground-plan of the house preserved right up to the Empire the old Megaron type.²¹ The double entrance-hall can be directly compared with the palaces of Mycene and Tiryns. Although, in the course of time, the cult of Vesta obtained a seat of its own, yet the

former hearth of the Regia, the sacred centre of the whole system, still remained on its old spot. It, too, in its circular foundation, reminds us of the characteristics of the Mycenaean altar. What meaning is to be attached to the common features of architectural form, whether it is a case of borrowing or of a form of Northern European origin, inherited by both parties, need not here be asked. Certainly, the Megaron house is already attested for the Villanova culture of Bologna and later also in Satricum (Conca) in Latium.²²

2. THE CAPITOLINE TEMPLE AND ITS IMPORTANCE

It will always be the mark of a genuinely great and significant creation, that it expresses as complete and therefore valid form what the earlier and contemporary world has imagined itself more or less distinctly to feel. It fulfils in authoritative form what has been indicated only imperfectly and fragmentarily in the previous course of development.

Such a creation was the plastic art of Greece with its discovery of the perfect human body. That body alone was for the future worthy to be the vessel of the godhead. Its triumphal march is almost without comparison even among the great creations of the Greek spirit; Italy it took by storm.

This success is only intelligible if the soil lay already prepared for the new growth. We have just shown that Rome herself was already on the same path; there, too, on rare occasions, the divine could reveal itself in human form. But what was thus guessed and only half begun could not reach completion by its own unaided efforts. It was from without, in the course of the sixth century, that the plastic cult-image, and with it the human expression of the deity, reached Rome in its completest form. That it should have been so was determined by those same necessities that determined the course of Roman history,

The original agreement between the Greek and Roman form of expression, rich in results as it may be, should not dull our eyes to the serious differences between the two. Whereas Greece, having once grasped the decisive conception, gave to it an unrivalled validity, Rome, on the other hand, was far removed from such an inspired onesidedness. The

appearance of the divine in human form represented only one possibility ; the animal shape stands beside it with equal rights.

A second factor, which represents a very essential difference, is the ideal rendering of the human body, which was chosen to be the vessel of the divine. This ideal rendering is inseparable from the fully developed plastic representation of the image of the god, and only, in fact, reaches its full expression in it. It is only under the influence of art that it is possible to neglect all individual accidents and set over against the natural creation a purified and spiritualized one, which can comprehend the scattered beauties in one single shape. But in Latium and Rome, as we have already said, there were only hints of an independent development of plastic art ; of the plastic rendering of the cult-image there could be no question.

Here, in fact, almost everything was reserved for Greece. In this case, as in others, it exercised its influence not directly but by way of Etruria. It is to the Etruscans that the oldest plastic creations on Italian soil go back. We may think of the figures of sandstone of the type of the Greek ξόανα, which have been found in Chiusi,²³ or of the very ancient pieces from Vetulonia²⁴ and Vulci.²⁵ The grave-paintings of the full archaic period, from Caere, which to-day are preserved in the British Museum and in the Louvre, show such a ξόανον, set on a basis with steps.²⁶

Inseparable from the cult-image is, as we have already seen, the existence of a cult-building of the nature of a human house. At quite an early date the Etruscans had adopted the beginnings of the Doric temple²⁷ and developed it independently, especially in its spatial formation.²⁸ The earliest examples—the temple of Juno Curitis in Falerii,²⁹ the Veientine temple near the Isola Farnese, or the shrines of Marzabotto, of which we have soon to speak—all go back into this age.

Both innovations set foot in Rome with the Tarquins. The most notable monument here is the Capitoline temple.

At an earlier point we have spoken of the *Capitolium vetus*, which offered under one roof a seat to the deities Jupiter, Juno and Minerva. It lay within the oldest unified

city community, on the Quirinal; but the triad, as such, represented an innovation as against the original circle of deities. In the calendar it is not recorded, and even if Jupiter by himself and, perhaps, Juno too had a place, the cult of Minerva from every point of view represents an innovation. From the first, this group of deities seems to have been designed to replace in its central position the older triad of Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus. This was bound to lead to the endeavour to express in external forms, too, the importance of the new cult. Whereas originally it had only a small and unadorned shrine to call its own, it now received an incomparably more majestic building.

It lay on the Capitoline Hill, on its southern summit, the *Capitolium* proper. With its erection the decisive step was first taken beyond the former boundaries of the city, and a new hill was drawn into them. We have already seen that this extension implies that the Forum, too, was included. It ceased now to be a cemetery; at the same time the marshy depression, that stretched to the Velabrum and the Tiber, was drained and converted into a market-place to serve the public requirements of the community. This drainage system, the later *Cloaca maxima*, as it was called, has survived the vicissitudes of time down to the present day. Roman tradition attributes its building to the last Etruscan king, even as it ascribes the erection of the Capitoline temple to another of the race, Tarquinius Priscus. Without laying too much stress on the details, we may maintain that the decisive events in this extension of the city belong to the Etruscan Tarquins and fall in the second half of the sixth century. It was only now that Rome ceased to be a mere agglomeration of more or less coherent settlements and became a city-whole. The story of the sack of Rome by the Gauls excludes a proper circumvallation of the city as late as the beginning of the fourth century; the 'Servian' wall, that is still visible in its remains in Rome, only belongs to the age after the catastrophe. But, in spite of this, Rome now presented itself on the north-west as on other quarters in a more closed form. Here lay the citadel, which carried the representative shrine; at its foot lay a large open space for assemblies and other occasions of the commonweal.

The Capitoline temple itself, the mighty foundations of which ³⁰ have been exposed by excavation, was built on the Etruscan scheme of three 'cellae', such as can also be proved for the earlier shrine of Juno Curitis in Falerii, the Capitolium of Signia, the newly discovered temple of Orvieto, and other shrines. The arrangement in detail was this: Jupiter received the central 'cella', Juno and Minerva the two at the sides. For the ornamentation and revetment of the building we have an indirect evidence in the statement that, before the work of Gorgasos and Darnophilos on the temple of Ceres, everything in Roman temples was of Etruscan origin (Pliny, *n. h.* 35, 154). With this the data of archaeology agree; they have supplied us with several roof-tiles of the same sort as those yielded by the excavations at Veii, Falerii, Satricum and other sites of Etruscan or Etrusco-Latin art.

In especial, we are told that, for the equipment of the Capitoline temple with statuary, artists from the south of Etruria were brought in. Tarquinius Priscus is said to have summoned a certain Volca from the neighbouring Veii to make the earthenware cult-image of Jupiter and a quadriga, also of earthenware, as acroterion (Pliny, *n. h.* 35, 157); Plutarch (*Popl.* 13) makes Tarquinius Superbus give the order to *Τυρρηνοῖς τιλὴν ἐκ Οὐλίων δημιουργοῖς*. The temple was not dedicated until 509 or 507. Work on it, then, continued over several decades and the sculptural ornamentation will only have been taken in hand at the last; the evidence of Plutarch, then, can claim preference as regards the date. The art of Volca and his school is revealed again in the group of Apollo from Veii, which is important from so many points of view.³¹ The surviving remains allow us to realize that Apollo was fighting in the presence of other gods for a hind that lay in bonds on the ground; perhaps this work, too, was designed as an acroterion. How the triad was to be conceived may be realized from the more or less contemporary remains of earthenware statues of life-size that have been found in the excavations of the temple of Mater Matuta, in Satricum in Latium.³² For Jupiter,³³ then, and Juno, the Greek form of representation of Zeus and Hera was adopted, for Minerva that of Athena.

How much wider a part Greek conceptions may have played in the Capitoline triad, we need not here ask. The cult was adopted in Rome in the first place from Etruria. Jupiter corresponds to the Etruscan *tin*, *tinia*, and the Latin Juno was known even earlier north of the Tiber as *uni*; Juno Regina appears there as goddess of the citadel of Veii. There, too, Minerva meets us as early as the sixth century; her home, in the narrower sense, was probably the half-Etruscan Falerii.³⁴ The discipline of the Etruscans taught that, when a city was founded, shrines must be erected to these three deities (Servius Dan., *Aen.* 1, 422). From Etruscan and central Italian cities we have remains of temples and triple 'cellae', in which it is easy to see triads analogous to the Capitoline. But in all cases—Florence Orvieto, Veii, Signia, Terracina—such a connexion is still only hypothetical. The finds and inscriptions admit of no final decision.³⁵ In the case of the two temples of Marzabotto (C and E) a renewed scrutiny has failed to yield proof even of the existence of the three 'cellae'.³⁶

With the Capitoline triad, for the first time, the highly developed forms of architecture and plastic art from Etruria found their way into Rome. The importance of this event becomes clear from its after-effects. Not only was the model given, for a long time to come, for the further development of the external forms of cult, but men hastened to adorn other shrines, already in existence, in the new manner. The same Volca to whom belonged the statue of the Capitoline Jupiter, is said to have made a similar statue for Hercules, who had only just been introduced to Rome (Pliny, *n. h.* 35, 157). The excavations on the Palatine have revealed remains of a temple of the beginning of the fifth century. We shall have to recognize in this the temple of Victoria, whose high antiquity is attested by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1, 32, 5).³⁷

But we have not yet exhausted the importance of the new foundation on the Capitol. It has been remarked again and again that a series of connexions exists between Jupiter Optimus Maximus of the Capitol and that cult, which was paid to Jupiter Latiaris on the *mons Albanus* as chief of the communities of Latium, united under Roman

leadership, the *prisci Latini*. The equipment of the two shrines was, it is true, quite distinct; in its limitation to a platform with steps on both sides, to an altar, 'aedicula', and springs, the Alban Mount still reflects its antiquity in very much later times.³⁸ But the sacrifice of white bulls meets us at both sites; the Alban festival is celebrated in Rome itself by a chariot-race, and, finally, both shrines are the end and goal of a solemn triumph. By it the victorious general paid his thanks to the gods and brought them their share of the booty, *ut dis immortalibus honos habeatur* (Livy 38, 45, 11; 41, 6, 4).

Whereas the Alban triumph started from the Appian Way, then moved on without any long detours along the *via triumphalis* that still survives in part to-day, up the mount and ended at the temple, the Roman triumph had a much more complicated route to master. It cannot from the first have been the same as it later was; Roman history certainly leads us to postulate several phases in its development.³⁹ The procession began on the Field of Mars; there, by the *porta triumphalis*, sacrifice was offered and the gate passed. It then proceeded in the direction of the *Porta Carmentalis*, which lay behind the *Forum holitorium*, at the foot of the Capitol; when in later times the Circus Flaminius was erected, the opportunity was not neglected of parading the procession before the masses there assembled. Originally, it took from there the shorter way through the Velabrum to the Capitol; it was only after the erection of the Servian Wall that the detour round the Palatine and over the Sacred Way was taken.

The triumpher appeared clothed in magnificent array. This, too, came, as we are expressly told, from Etruria, just as the very word, *triumphus*, points to an Etruscan origin for the whole custom.⁴⁰ In its detail the costume consisted of the embroidered *tunica palmata* and the covering *toga picta* with golden stars; on the triumpher's head rested the laurel-wreath. The car with four horses on which he rode, the ivory sceptre, the golden crown of Jupiter, which because of its weight had to be held by a servant—all these were bound to make the victorious general the image of the god. There can be no possible doubt that he was not

merely *Iovis Optimi Maximi ornatu decoratus* (Livy, 10, 7, 10), but that he was actually the bearer and possessor of the divine power.⁴¹ That was why the triumpher was bound to paint his hands and face with vermillion, like the earthenware statue of Jupiter in the Capitoline temple; it was only thus that the identity could be fully expressed.⁴²

After the completion of the sacrifices began the second part of the festival. The whole *pompa triumphalis* took its way through the city back to the Circus Maximus, which it had already touched on its way in. Here were celebrated the *ludi magni*, the battle-games, which, according to Mommsen's likely guess,⁴³ were originally part of the triumph. It was only in later times that they developed into a regular festival, independent of the single triumphs. But the old connexion works on, and the magistrate, who holds the games, appears in the garb of the triumpher and the festival itself was attached to the foundation-day of the Capitoline temple, the 18th of September.

Just a word is required about the games themselves. What was later the Circus Maximus rose on the spot where once by the altar of Consus, in the valley between Palatine and Aventine, the festival of the Consualia had taken place with its games. In accordance with the foundation of the Capitol, the Roman tradition traces back the erection of the earliest Circus and the institution of the *ludi magni* to the Tarquins.⁴⁴ Of the horse and chariot-races it is expressly recorded that they were adopted from the Etruscans. For Etruria the frescoes of the Tomba Casaccini, the antefixes and terracotta friezes of Veii and Caere, enable us to realize the importance of these games. Herodotus preserves the story of a γυμνικός καὶ ἵππικός ἀγών, which the people of Caere (Ἀγυλλαῖοι) founded in honour of Apollo after the battle of Alalia (1, 167).

The circus-building proper must be thought of as a simple, wooden tribune, from which the spectators followed the course of the games. The contemporary frescoes of the Tomba Stackelberg in Jarquinii may give us some idea of the arrangements. If we remember that the games themselves had originally a purely religious character and formed an integral part of the sacred ceremonies, we find a series of

analogous cases pressing on our notice. We may think of the temple of Dionysos in Athens, at the foot of the citadel, round the circular orchestra of which we must imagine a similar building, set on wooden supports. We have also to mention a series of smaller buildings, from which one could look on at ceremonies of cult.⁴⁵ In the Cretan palace of Phaestus there was a stairway for spectators, which led down to a dance-place, probably also used for cult purposes. Just as in the middle of the Roman circus rose a row of shrines, round which the races took place, so at Phaestos little chapels stand at the sides of the stairs. The Greek cult took over this arrangement, as, for example, the shrine of Despoina in Lycosyra may show. There rises by the side of the temple a similar stage, designed for spectators; from it one could through a door follow the sacred ceremony within the 'cella'. We need not follow at this point the further development in architecture as we find it at the Telesterion of Eleusis on the one hand, and in the stone theatres and stadia on the other. Like the building of temples and the cult-image, the Circus, too, ultimately goes back to Greek forms; in all these cases the Etruscans were essentially no more than intermediaries. There is yet another institution that must be mentioned. The foundation-day of Capitoline Jupiter, the 13th of September, was from the first celebrated by the offering to the god of a solemn banquet. Originally, this must have taken place in the form of the simple supply of an *epulum*, as happened on another occasion with the collation (*daps*). We also hear tell of the throwing out of the *daps* or the *cena*. It was customary at the cult of the Mother of the Lares, and reminds us of the procedure at the Greek banquets of Hecate.⁴⁶ In historical times, the rule was, that a *lectus* (κλίνη) was set for Jupiter, whilst his two female partners sat to share in the meal. In that case, the Greek custom of the *lectisternium* had already found its way in—a custom which first appears, with an exact date, in Rome in the year 399. On that occasion there was a regular entertainment of three pairs of deities in all, in which their doll-like images were laid on the couch and the meals were served before them.

How old the use of a *lectus* for Jupiter is, is not directly

recorded. Wissowa⁴⁷ wished to place it not earlier than the year 196, when a special board of *tresviri epulones* was created. But the custom in itself is much earlier in Rome, and, if in the year 399 three pairs were fed with feasts lasting eight days, we must assume that something similar, in simpler form, took place on the earlier occasion as well. We shall be the readier to do so now that the *lectisternium* can be proved for the middle of the fifth century in the neighbouring Etruria; on the frescoes of the Tomba del letto funebre of Jarquinii a ceremony of this kind has been rightly recognized;⁴⁸ it belongs to the cult of the Dioscuri, as can be proved in detail.⁴⁹ Etruscan sarcophagi, again, of the same period show the existence, side by side, of *lectus* and *sella*, just as we have described them for the Capitoline triad. We therefore reach an early date for the practice; of that there can be no doubt. Whether on the foundation-day of the temple of the Capitoline Jupiter a *lectus* was from the first set out, or whether the Greek custom only came in some decades later, is less important than the establishment of the fact that it is, in general, a very ancient practice, and that here, too, the Etruscans played the part of intermediaries.

So far we have only been discussing from whence the Capitoline cult came and what foreign element, whether of Greek or Etruscan nature, it brought with it. In contrast to this stands the fact that to the Romans themselves the cult never counted as foreign. Not only was it for them the most distinguished cult of all, but for long the existence of Rome, the belief in its durability and unrivalled greatness, seemed to be inseparable from the deities of the Capitol. In view of this extraordinary national importance, we may, at least, raise the question whether, when we have summed up all the forms that it took over, we have exhausted the meaning of the new foundation; whether, in and beside the borrowed elements, something national may not be revealed, which in a quite exclusive sense may count as Roman.^{49a}

We must observe, in the first place, that between the individual members of the triad no sort of connexion by relationship exists. Minerva, who as Athene is daughter of Zeus and so, too, in the neighbouring Etruria, daughter of *tin*, is on the Capitol partner in cult of Jupiter and no more.

Juno, again, who in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome was conceived of as wife of Jupiter⁶⁰ and who, in her Etruscan form, *uni*, appears in wedlock with the lord of heaven, has no such character in the Roman cult. In contrast to the Etruscan model there is no remembrance here of marriage and genealogy among the gods. In this exclusion of qualities, which in all other cases are indissolubly connected with the ancient divine world, scholars have long since attempted to recognize a peculiarity of the Roman conception of deity. But this exclusion has been thought of as something given from the start, something that was present there from the very beginnings of Roman religion. That this view is not permissible we have already observed. In its very early days the Roman people represented its deities to itself as fathers and mothers, believed in the Sun as a divine ancestor of the race, and represented the Lares as children of a mother who was named after them. With everything of that kind the Capitoline cult makes a break; we may add that it is the first case to our knowledge in which the break was made.

With the establishment of this fact, we have gained a point of momentous importance in the history of Roman religion. A second conclusion at once results. The deities of the Capitoline triad are, as such, without myth. Through their lack of any family connexion the way to it is barred for them. Juno and Minerva are simply an occasion of cult and an exclusively state cult; herein lies their limitation, herein too their unique greatness. Neither legend nor fancy has ever dared to weave its webs round this trinity, which chose to abide in majestic isolation.

Again we have encountered the view once held, that Roman religion from the first lacked myth, and we have had to take our stand against it. It is precisely for the earliest period that the existence of myth is evident. Again it is the Capitoline cult that marks a new break, in so far as it for the first time reveals a deliberate exclusion and repression of myth. But it does not merely give us the negative side, the loss and the gap which marks the place where the lost had been, but it also gives us the new element that it placed in the stead of the old. Historical legend and history stepped

in at Rome as the heirs. This sphere had from the very first been connected in Rome with the being and working of the gods and had received its impulses from their world.

It has been possible to demonstrate that not only the triumph itself, but also the recording of the single triumphs won in the course of the centuries, was most intimately connected with the Capitoline temple. The lists of this kind, of the original appearance of which the recently discovered *Fasti of Urbisaglia*⁵¹ or the Barberini tables (CIL I. 1² p. 75 f.) will give a vivid idea, originally noted merely the completion of the triumph and the laying of the laurel before the image of Jupiter. They gave neither year, dates nor origin of the triumpher; they were intended to be merely lists for purposes of cult, comparable to an inventory of offerings. But in course of time this list grew out of its immediate cult-object to be a record that spread the tidings of Rome's victories over the whole world. This of necessity led to a re-editing and later enlargement of the lists themselves; the process began, it seems, towards the close of the second century and found its completion in the Augustan age.⁵² Immediately out of cult springs a form of tradition, which may be called in the highest sense historical.

No treatment of the Capitoline temple would be complete that omitted a final reference to the Sibylline Books. These Greek books of prophecy were, according to the tradition, derived from Cumae and were supposed to have come to Rome under the last Tarquin; we can hardly evade the suggestion that the Etruscans of Campania were the intermediaries. The oracles found their place in the cellar of the temple of Jupiter; like the Books themselves, their contents were kept in the strictest ward. At quite an early date the collection must have been enlarged beyond its original scope, as is at once suggested by the probable reception of the *carmina Marciana* in the year 212.⁵³ The only two surviving fragments of the early Republic may be dated with some certainty to the turn of the third and second centuries.⁵⁴

These Sibylline Books and the authority, which was entrusted with the task of guarding and questioning them, the *IIviri sacris faciundis*, proved to be of supreme im-

portance for the history of Roman religion. It was at their bidding that, in the event, most of the Greek cults were introduced to Rome; the questioning of the oracles led for the first time in 499 to the vowing of a temple. Above all, their adoption cannot be separated from that of the god, Apollo. His chief Italian sect was at Cumae and stood there in the closest association with the oracle of the Sibyl. Thus the college of the *Ilviri* is directly called *antistites Apollinaris sacri*; as sign of their office they bear tripod and dolphin, the symbols of the god.

The importance of the Roman Apollo in general will come up for discussion later in connexion with the other 'Homeric' deities. Here we will merely remark about his date, that, although he did not receive a temple of his own until 431, yet an *Apollinare* is already mentioned on the same site as early as 499 (Livy 3, 63, 7). Not only does the date of the reception of Apollo agree with that of the Sibylline Books, but the god, like them, probably came to Rome through Etruscan influence.⁵⁵

We began this chapter with a comparison between the Pisistratids and the Tarquins. In the case just mentioned the analogy is palpable. Not only had the Etruscan kings of Rome their Sibylline Books, but the Attic tyrants, too, assembled a collection of oracles on the citadel.⁵⁶ Onomacritus, who had been entrusted with the task of collecting the oracles, was banished by Hipparchus for having, it was said, added a false oracle to those of Musaeus (Herodotus 7, 6, 8; we hear of an oracle of Musaeus, relating to the Battle of Salamis: 8, 96, 2).⁵⁷ At a later date, when the Pisistratids in their turn were banished, Cleomenes made himself master of the collection (Herodotus 5, 90, 2).

Chapter III

FRESH INFLUX OF GREEK CULTS

1. JUTURNA AND HERCULES

THE earliest calendar of festivals corresponded to an extent of the city, that included not only the Septimontium, but also the Quirinal. As it was the inclusion of the settlement on the Quirinal that, in all probability, gave the immediate occasion for the codification of this cycle of festivals, by the time that the next extension took place the calendar could already look back on a long term of life. There exists, then, the possibility that in this period some further cults were received. Or, in other words, we must reckon with the possibility that, before the Capitol and forum were drawn into the city-whole, the circle of deities and cults included in the calendar had been enlarged by several members.

A new foundation of this kind seems to exist in the cult of Juturna and the DioscURI, who are associated with her.¹ All the indications that can be used to determine the date, above all, the observation that this cult was not placed under the official care of the *Ilviri sacris faciundis* and, therefore, came to Rome without previous consultation of the Sibylline Books, lead us to place its introduction before the end of the sixth century. With this the tradition seems to conflict, according to which the temple of the two gods was not vowed until 499 and not built before 484. But the worship of the spring, Juturna, was from the outset connected with that of the DioscURI. Not only was it brought into connexion with the two succouring deities by the legend of their appearance at it after the Battle of Lake Regillus, but on one occasion it is actually called their spring. The very name, Juturna,² (earlier *Diuturna*) seems to point in the same direction. Whilst the first part of the name is connected

with the Latin root **div-*, which appears in *Diana*, *Dea Dia*, and, above all, in the stem *Jov-* and in the name of Jupiter, the second part is Etruscan. It shows the well-known suffix *-tur* or *thur-*, denoting filiation. Here then we should have to see one of those mixed formations of Latin and Etruscan that are known elsewhere to occur; its purpose was simply to express the fact that Juturna belonged to the **Diutures*, the 'sons of Zeus'. The connexion is the more probable, as in other cases, too, the Dioscouri are connected in cult and legend with a spring or nymph.³

Here we find the explanation of an extraordinary feature of the cult of the Dioscouri, or, as it was called in Rome, the cult of Castor—the situation of the temple on the forum. Strongly as it conflicts with the usual custom, by which all Greek cults adopted after the conclusion of the earliest calendar were placed outside the *pomerium*, the sacred boundary of the city, this peculiarity would find its perfect explanation, if the temple was only placed in the forum to admit of its being in immediate touch with the spring of Juturna, that was so closely linked to the cult of the Dioscouri.

We have, it must be admitted, only deferred the solution of the problem. The question arises anew—how came the spring of Juturna to its place inside the *pomerium*? To this there can be only one answer. The association of this spring with Juturna and the Dioscouri must have been accomplished at a time when the forum did not yet belong to the territory of the city proper. This brings us to that same stage of the development of Rome that lies before us in the earliest calendar.

It is not without importance that, as we have observed, the name of Juturna points to an Etruscan origin for the goddess and, therefore, for the Dioscouri, too. A spring of the same name lay not far from the river, Numicus, and we may connect with this the fact that an old cult of the divine twins existed in the neighbouring Ardea. As strong Etruscan influence is plain in this very city, we shall have to look here for the beginning of the Roman cult of Juturna and the Dioscouri.⁴

The recent excavations in Ardea⁵ have revealed two temples of archaic style, one of which must have belonged

to Venus, the other either to Juno Regina or to the heavenly twins. But, in Rome, it is not the Dioscuri, but Castor alone, who is lord (CIL. I² 2, 2, 2500, l. 89 *πρὸ τοῦ καοῦ Κάστρος*); Pollux is no brother, but only temple-companion of Castor. Whereas in the whole of Italy the sons of Zeus were designated as such (Marsian *ioviois puclōis*, Pelignian *iovies puclēs*, Etruscan *tinias clinar*), and a similar designation still shows in the name of Juturna, in Rome the divine sonship and brotherhood is denied.⁶ Here we see the workings of that decisive change which had been brought about by the introduction of the Capitoline triad.

Another god, whose reception probably falls in this period, is Hercules. We must restrict our discussion of him within narrow bounds, as in his cult a number of questions remain unsolved. The work of Bayet⁷ has followed them up with skill and acumen, but of a solution even of the questions of history and date there can as yet be no question.

According to the express testimony of Tacitus (*Annales* 12, 24), the earliest shrine of Hercules, the Ara Maxima on the Forum Boarium,⁸ lay within the *pomerium* of the Palatine settlement, marked out as it was by *cippi*. What we are to make of this position cannot yet be answered with any certainty. Wissowa⁹ supposed that Hercules was not taken over directly from the Greeks, but through the mediation of a neighbouring Latin community, probably Tibur; that was why in sacred law his cult was not regarded as foreign. But the example of the Dioscuri, which he adduces in comparison, has already found a different explanation, and we find a series of Greek deities adopted in this way through Italian intermediaries without receiving any such privileged position.¹⁰ Perhaps we should bear in mind that the service at the Ara Maxima was not originally managed by the state, but was left to the families of the *Potitii* and *Pinarii*; not till the year 312 did the taking over by the community ensue. Perhaps, then, it was a case of a gentile cult, subjected to regulations distinct from those of the state.

Certain it is at least that the Roman Hercules goes back to a remarkably early age. In the rest of central Italy he appears as early as the sixth to fifth century; ¹¹ in Rome,

he, like the DioscURI, was received before the appearance of the Sibylline oracles. In the same direction points the lay-out of the shrine itself, which must go back beyond the introduction of the temple-building proper.

The Ara Maxima was, to quote the words of Dionysus of Halicarnassus (1, 40, 6), τῇ . . . κατασκευῇ πολὺ τῆς . . . δόξης καταδεέστερος; it still reminded one of that earliest form of cult-site that we have described. The altar itself lay within a simple *temenos*, bounded by a wall; no temple, no roof even was erected over it. It is of importance that the ancient place of the DioscURI by the spring of Juturna likewise showed the same simple character. Even in the Empire the equipment was restricted to a walled basin, in which the waters of the spring collected. An altar that has been found in the neighbourhood, with a representation of Juturna and her legendary brother, Turnus, stood under the open sky. Only on one of its two shorter sides lay a small roofed building, which contained the actual cult-image of the goddess.

What links the cult of Hercules to that of Juturna is not merely the similarity of the place of cult and the date of introduction, but the common origin. Both cults set out from Greek South Italy and, from there, set foot in Campania and Latium. The places of the cult of the DioscURI enable us in some measure to follow their progress, and the same is true for Hercules. Dionysus of Halicarnassus remarks of him (1, 40, 6) that he possesses sacred precincts and altars at many places in Italy, and that you cannot easily find a region where his cult has remained unknown. This statement is fully confirmed by the evidence of literature, inscriptions and archaeology. The age and extension of both cults denote a new support for the view that Italy, even in the period that we are discussing, formed a historical unity.

One final point. Hercules, like the DioscURI, was designated the 'helper in need'. The help is rendered in different directions. He gives prosperity of many kinds, they protect men from disease and danger, especially on the stormy sea.¹² But both are helpers in battle, and this is of great importance. Beginning with the figure of Aias, P. Vonder Mühl¹³ has shown how early the idea of such helpers begins. Even

before the religion of Homer they entered the saga as *ἥρωες πρόμαχοι*. But whereas a transformation to heroes in the Homeric sense took place in their case—and this is true not only of Aias and Achilles, but of the Dioscuri, too: *Iliad*. 8, 236 f.—in an older age they were exclusively objects of religious belief. And, as with all powers of the pre-Homeric age,¹⁴ with them, too, appears the fettering to the earth. This is true not only of the Dioscuri,¹⁵ but of Hercules, too; in principle, at least, Bayet¹⁶ seems to have made good his proof.

2. THE RECEPTION OF THE HOMERIC DEITIES

As long as it was possible for Roman religion to represent the godhead in the form of animals, so long did this involve an attachment to nature and the elemental. Animal-form and cult-worship in groves and at springs, in grottoes and on hills, are connected, not only in point of date, but also in their inner being. It is the formless element in nature, her boundlessness and her flux, in which man can find his place and lose himself.

If this lack of distance from the elemental realm is characteristic of the earliest period, the introduction of a cult-image in human form and of a house belonging to the god denotes a clear retreat and withdrawal from that sphere. Thought can no longer stray in the other direction, but is fixed in one sense. Restricted to the human body as formed by plastic art, the ideal body, in fact, the image of the god is kept within his shrine, which for its part is no longer set in nature (as for example, is a grove), but is erected according to its proper laws, the laws of architecture.

When once the ideal human figure came to mean the regular form in which the divine could appear, spirit had taken the place of nature. For this figure was not something given, but a new and creative element. The truly antique idea of an autonomy of art over against the apparent and imperfect reality, as it is here expressed, necessarily points beyond itself to a corresponding conception of the divine nature. That, too, is based no more on nature, but on the spirit. Behind the external transformation of

cult appears an inner transformation, in which a decisive change in the conception of the gods is revealed.

The Apollo of Veii cannot at once be compared to the Apollo of the Vatican. Any one who can follow Winckelmann's enthusiasms¹⁷ in what for him was a religion will miss much there. The overwhelming impression which the sudden appearance from another world makes, the divine ease of the limbs, the sublime expression ('anger snorts from the nose and a joyous contempt hovers on the lips'), are rendered in this form here and nowhere else, even in Greek art. But if you seek in the work of the Etruscan force and manly nobility, you will not be disappointed. In the mighty, overbearingly victorious stride of the god you will find a reflection of the majesty of Apollo. It is already that figure that Homer and his world saw; he is the *λίην ἀτάσθαλος* who, in the Delian Hymn to Apollo, frightens away the gods from the banquet with his bow. With this masterpiece the decisive event of the history of Greek religion begins to find its record in the art of ancient Italy—the creation of the Homeric world of gods.

In Greek history the appearance of these gods represents no original element. Before them lies an age in which a plurality of divine figures already exists.¹⁸ All of them belong to the same sphere; they are connected with the earth in the duality of her functions, the giving birth to the living and the hiding the departed and the dead. It is a realm in the centre of which stands the maternal, the earth-goddess in her various forms of appearance. From the sanctity of the ordinances that she establishes the whole of human life takes its shape. In face of this female element the male is not indeed missing, but takes a secondary place. The power of begetting is more strongly emphasized for it than in later times; but it represents no true balance, only a completion of the powers of motherhood.

This circle of ideas had found its echo in the earliest stratum of Rome. The earth-mother under her various names (Ceres, Tellus, Flora, Furrina) has met us there; so too have Hephaistos and Dionysos in their counterparts, Volcanus and Liber. We were unable to find a single one of the gods who stand in the foreground in the religion of Homer.

Their introduction only followed some considerable time later, beginning about the second half of the sixth century. The two main epochs, into which the history of the earlier Greek religion is divided, find their counterpart on the side of Rome.

It is quite another world that comes in with the religion of Homer. It left to the deities of the older age the rank and dignity that appertained to them.¹⁹ But henceforward they do not represent the sole forms in which the divine can appear, but above them has risen a new realm. It is released from the bondage to earth, from anything that could fetter it to the world of the elements. The female is no longer dominant; the new gods are of male sex—or, at least, decidedly champion the male spirit. Therefore, they represent nothing limited by matter, whether by the sanctity of earth, fire or sea, but always a totality. They are related to the whole extent of human life, and their limitation lies only in their spiritual form. Or, to put it in other words, the whole of human life is seen in them, one by one, from a definite standpoint; each god possesses a mode of being special to himself, and a form distinct and limited to him.

Thus in Apollo are revealed distance and sublimity, noble poise and spiritual symmetry; in Athena are revealed insight and sage energy; in Aphrodite, the *χαρίς* that enchants and snatches men away in ecstasy; in Artemis, the far-away and the wild, untamed 'outside' world, but, no less, the passion and sharpness of the young virgin. In Hermes expression is found for the night, the dark, with its astonishing and magic powers, its deception and happy success, its enticement and its appeasement.

In Rome these deities all appear at about the same time. The tradition of literature and monuments enables us to fix the approximate date.

At about the turn of the sixth and fifth centuries appears a series of notices relating to the vowing and dedication of temples. The history of religion has long been accustomed to count on them as sure data, and we must not say that it has done wrong in this. It is, in fact, a special feature of the earlier Roman tradition, that it has preserved, on the

side of events of cult and religion, evidence of value that bears the stamp of authenticity. In this it differentiates itself markedly from the reports that it has to give of events in home and foreign politics, and this distinction undoubtedly goes back to the fact that the preservation of the historical tradition was originally in the hands of the 'pontifices', that is to say, of a priestly authority.²⁰

Thus, for example, we have accepted the date of dedication of the Capitoline temple as a fixed point; closer consideration only confirms us in thinking that we have actually here a first-class tradition.²¹ We have done the same in the case of the temple of Castor. Our evidence is that it was vowed in 499 and dedicated in 484. The research that has been undertaken on its remains has, at least, yielded proof that the earliest building agrees with the technique of the Capitoline temple and should therefore be placed as close to it in date as possible.²²

We are now concerned with another group which, like the temple just mentioned, belongs to Greek deities. The shrines of this group, with one exception soon to be mentioned, are all on the Aventine Hill. The dedication of the temple of Mercurius is dated to the year 495, and this is answered by the fact that in the neighbouring Falerii the temple *ai sassi caduti* belonged to a god of similar name and nature²³ and itself, as the splendid acroterion that has been found shows, goes back as early as the turn of the sixth and fifth centuries.²⁴ For the temple of Apollo on the Flaminian meadows, which, according to our sources, was vowed on the occasion of a pestilence in 488 and dedicated in 481, the appearance of a pestilence at the same date in the east of the Mediterranean supplies a certain confirmation.²⁵ No dates are given for the temples of Diana and Minerva on the Aventine, but that they, as has long since been guessed, also belong to the end of the kingly period is shown by dedicatory inscriptions of the same age which have been found in the *stips votiva* of the temple of Veii.²⁶ There recur not only *thurms*, that is, Mercurius or Hermes, but also *menerva* and *arilimi*, that is, Minerva-Athena and Diana-Artemis. We have a final confirmation in the fact that, in the recently discovered temple of Orvieto, the building

of which starts with the beginning of the fifth century, the cult of Minerva is again assured.²⁷

Here we have before us a closed circle of deities; they all belong to the Homeric world of gods. That not only Apollo and Hermes, under the name of Mercurius, were received, but that Diana, too, was from the start identical with Artemis and Minerva with Athena has been shown in another context.²⁸ The exhaustive treatment that the subject receives there justifies us in limiting our remarks here to a few on general principles.

In the first place we must emphasize the fact that this world of gods, like the former, came to Rome through foreign mediation. Again it was Etruria, especially the south of the country, that played the part of mediator. The fact that probably all these deities were received towards the end of the kingly period, under the rule of the Tarquins, is inevitably connected with this. How far the attribution to any particular king is correct is a question of secondary importance. It will certainly, however, be no accident that the Roman tradition makes the ruling family spring from Greece, from the Bacchiad, Demaratus.²⁹ He and his descendants meet us in other connexions as bringers of the great benefits of Greek culture; in this case, they delivered to Italy the decisive religious creation of the Greek spirit. The guess now presses on us that we have to do, not with an approximately contemporary and complete adoption of the Homeric world of gods, but with one deliberately planned and carried through. Just as in the earliest calendar one seemed to see a hand at work, arranging and shaping,³⁰ so here we may imagine that we can trace a similar activity.

If this is correct, the Tarquins take a position of central importance in early Roman culture. We have already observed that such a decisive transformation of the external forms of cult as appears in the foundation of the Capitoline temple was their work. To this we may now add the adoption of that circle of gods in which the Greek spirit has found one of its most classical expressions.

There are certain points of contact in both cases which we have already mentioned. From the first, emphasis was

laid on the political importance of the Capitoline cult. In view of its close connexion with the cult of Jupiter Latiaris on the Alban Mount, no doubt can arise that, just as that formed the religious centre of Latium in its entirety, so the Capitoline deities represented in a special sense the leading cult of the capital. A corresponding position recurs at least in the case of the Roman Diana. Her temple on the Aventine formed the League sanctuary for Rome and the Latins; its situation in Rome brought the hegemony of Rome no less clearly to expression than the fact that the Alban festival after the fall of Alba Longa was renewed under Roman presidency.⁸¹

But important as the institution of the cult of Diana on the Aventine may have been, and much as one would be inclined on general grounds to see the decisive motive of Roman action in the political field, yet this new event cannot be fully comprehended from this side alone. If Diana of the Aventine became a political as well as a religious centre, this is only a continuation of a process that may be observed for Artemis herself. The ancient tradition speaks directly of an imitation of the Ephesian goddess and her importance for all Ionia (Dion. Hal. 4, 25, 4 f.).⁸² This shows that Rome grasped the political significance where it was offered her, but did not go beyond the Greek model in pushing it into the foreground. We have rather to consider an entirely different point of view. We have to ask whether a creation of the Greek spirit, as important and rich in results as that represented in the creation of a new series of gods, did not exert its influence in its true character, as a creator of new form.

The science of religion has hitherto maintained that the unity of the great divine figures of Greece does not lie in their original creation and in the fixity of form that results from that, but that this unity is secondary and accidental, because conditioned by external causes. Through the changes of the political situation, through an increase of experiences which a people undergoes in the course of its development, the growth of the god is likewise conditioned. Far from representing a picture of individual, that is, of pure religious character, it gives us a faithful reflexion of the historical fortunes of the people among whom he is worshipped.

If this were so, the adoption of Greek deities in Rome would be a strange and almost unintelligible phenomenon. Those beings whose creation could only be conceived as the result of a special historical development, who were originally only created for a sphere strictly limited in space, would yet have succeeded in winning acceptance far beyond that sphere. We could only understand such an occurrence if some mighty centre of politics or trade had by its very importance won for its gods acceptance in foreign parts, too—an acceptance which was not in itself involved in their nature and which could certainly not be explained from religious factors alone. Of necessity an advance was next made to the postulate, that the reception of the Homeric gods in Italy could only be understood if we could demonstrate such a centre.²²

But it is just at this point that observations of a very different trend may be made. In a few cases it is still possible to name the neighbouring city of Italy from which the transference of one of these gods to Rome took place. In a number of cases we can adduce a Greek cult, which has supplied a starting-point for many customs and ideas. To take only one example, it may be affirmed with some certainty that the Roman cult of Minerva came from Falerii, that important elements of the earliest Latin cult of Diana came from the Peloponnese or, as we have already indicated, were taken over from the Ephesian goddess. Yet any attempt to understand the form of the deities now introduced to Rome merely by derivation from definite single cults, limited in content and place, would miss the vital point.

What is characteristic in this reception is this, that Rome of those days understood how to grasp the classical deities of the Greeks from the first in the whole of their extent. Athena-Minerva is not, as has sometimes been maintained, only the goddess of handicraft, Hermes-Mercurius is not only the god of trade. Minerva is from the start expressed in all her phases—as queen of the city, in war, in artistic skill of every kind, and in all the forms that are characteristic of her; Mercurius is the divine exponent of success of every kind. The intensity and depth with which the Romans

grasped these figures even went so far as to lead to the occasional creation of new individual forms from the same spirit. Rome learnt how to bring to full flower what was only suggested in the Greek model.

In proof of this, a special example may be cited. In the case of Diana, especially in her cult on the Aventine, the connexion with the slaves comes into great prominence.³⁴ In this respect she comes into touch with Artemis, and this agreement may be taken as one argument among many for that identity of the two goddesses that we champion. Against this the objection has been raised that a connexion with the slaves is no more characteristic for Diana than for other gods.³⁵ Put in this way the statement is certainly correct, but yet it misses the vital point. True, many deities may have stood in some relation or other to the non-free population. But it is not the mere fact that they did so, but how—that is the kernel of the matter.

We have tried to prove that in connexion with Diana the slave does not appear (as he well might do) as an associate of the house, but, on the contrary, as the 'stranger'. This implies that the connexion with the slaves is subordinated to that with the strangers in general, and this seems to be distinctive of Artemis herself. The strangers would, then, stand in connexion with her inmost being; they would belong to her as goddess of the outside world and of the far-away. The Roman cult of Diana, in giving especial prominence and clearness to these facts, has enabled us for the first time to understand the original cult of Artemis.

The inference which we must draw is the exact opposite of what has been believed. It was not as mere historical accidents (and certainly not as figures of poetic fancy) that the Greek gods worked, but as forms of inward clarity and truth. It was because they appeared as actual beings, as great realities of the religious sphere, as they always do, even down to our own day, that they had the power to conquer the Italian world, and others beside. Just as in plastic art and its creation of the ideal human form, so here contact is made with a truth; that is how the triumphal march of the new creation could be achieved. The history of Roman religion, then, helps us to understand the nature

of the Greek conception of divinity in its inward greatness and its historical importance. The reception of the Homeric gods in Rome becomes an event which does equal honour to both parties—to the Greek creator for seeing the reality, to the Roman for grasping it at once in its full scope.

3. THE GREEK RIGHT OF ASYLUM. THE INFLUENCE OF DELPHI

In Tarracina in Latium was worshipped, together with the youthful Jupiter, who there bore the name Anxurus, the goddess Feronia,³⁶ who again was identified with Juno Virgo. Servius, who tells us this in commenting on *Aeneid* 7, 799, adds in a later passage (8, 564) that in her shrine emancipated slaves with shorn heads received the *pileus*, the sign of their new status. Feronia, accordingly, who appears here as *nympha Campaniae*,³⁷ is directly designated goddess of freedmen (*libertorum dea*).

This information is confirmed by what is handed down about the Roman cult. Here, too, Feronia is connected with the freedmen. Livy 22, 1, 18 reports that in the year 217 B.C. the women of this class made a collection of money to give a present to the goddess. The one surviving dedication from Rome itself is actually set up by an *ancilla* (CIL. 6, 147). But on the most general grounds, as well, it is natural that Feronia should stand in relation with the non-free (and so with the freedmen, who proceed from them). A connexion of this kind appears regularly with chthonic goddesses, and it should not be missing in the case of Feronia, who is a manifestation of the earth-mother.³⁸ It is perhaps of significance in this respect that in Tarracina itself a spring appears in her shrine.³⁹ We may compare here the remarks of Wilamowitz⁴⁰ on the *Ἐλευθερον ὕδωρ* and the connexion of emancipation with water.

A further piece of news, that belongs to this same context, is found in the Servius Dan. on the passage already mentioned. After the rite of emancipation in the shrine of Tarracina has been mentioned, we hear that there was a stone seat there (*sedile lapideum*), on which a *senarius* was cut; it ran: *bene meriti servi sedeant, surgant liberi*.⁴¹ This in-

formation, too, refers, as will be proved in detail, to the emancipation of slaves; but no corresponding custom is mentioned as being in existence, only the existence of the *sedile* and its inscription. It seems, then, that it was no longer actually put into use; Servius or his authority found no more than the monument itself there. A closer scrutiny leads to the conclusion that the trace of a very ancient rite is here preserved.

Let us set out from a detail, the probable date of the *senarius*. It is harder to-day than ever to give an exact dating. Bücheler⁴² in his day still thought that he could place it not earlier than the age of the Gracchi, even while admitting that the custom, there attested, might go back earlier. To-day, we may be inclined to judge less confidently, now that *senarius* and *versus quadratus* seem to look back to an earlier time than once seemed likely.⁴³ The verse, as well as the custom, might date to early times.

But more important than the date of the *senarius* is its content. Bücheler has recognized that the emancipation of slaves here took the form of having to sit down on the *sedile* and receiving freedom through this symbolical action. Among the manifold forms of *manumissio*, which are known in Roman law, there is none that can be compared with this. All that can be offered as a parallel is a custom in Greece. It has always been recognized, that when the Cynic Crates, in the familiar story, accomplished his own emancipation ἀρθεὶς ὑπὲρ βωμοῦ, we may deduce from this parody a corresponding custom, actually practised.⁴⁴ Emancipation, then, could be effected in the form of sitting down on an altar. If we put this custom beside what is reported of Tarracina,⁴⁵ the actions in the two cases are externally so alike that we should be loth to separate them. The decisive point is that in each case, the sitting down on an altar or on the *sedile lapideum* in the shrine of Feronia, a cult-connexion must have stood behind the legal act. We have chanced upon one of those instances, so important for the history of the earliest Italian law, in which an immediate relation of law and religion can be observed.⁴⁶

The anecdote of Crates, to which we have referred, is connected by K. Latte, probably rightly, with an inscription

from Cos,⁴⁷ which, referring to the emancipation of slaves, speaks of τοὶ τοὺς δούλους καθίζοντες.⁴⁸ He reminds us that καθίζειν is the technical expression for the seeking out of an asylum; the fugitive or slave sits down beside or on the altar of the god and thus places himself under his protection. As the expression just quoted can only denote the emancipators of the slaves, the emancipation itself represents a symbolical act; 'the slave was placed on the altar and thus came under the protection of the god; he became ἱερός and free'. This means, then, that out of the widespread rite of asylum a sacred form of emancipation had been developed.

Can the custom in the shrine of Feronia be compared to this? The points of agreement that we have already seen in the anecdote of Crates recur here—the common motif of sitting down as a sign of emancipation, and the sacred associations of the legal act. More, we need not in the case of the altar and the *sedile lapideum* confine ourselves to supposing a mere analogy. That the word καθίζειν does not necessarily imply a sitting immediately on or even by the altar, but that the altar was only the most significant expression for the sacred precincts as a whole, is familiar. To take only one instance: the inscription of the mysteries of Andania (Dittenberger, *Syll.*³ nr. 736) simply says τοῖς δούλοις φύγιμον ἔστω τὸ ἱερόν (l. 52), not speaking of the altar alone; similarly those who claim the protection of the shrine are denoted as ὅσοι κα ἤνται.⁴⁹

We may express our results in this form; in Tarracina there exists a rite of emancipation that can only be understood in its form from the Greek right of asylum. To give expression to the transition of the former slave into the status of freedom, the form was selected by which a slave, ill-doer or stranger could escape the claims of property or the legal demands of another; he betook himself to the protection of a god and thus got beyond the reach of human pursuit.

The choice of this form of expression is only intelligible if at some time or other in Italy the Greek right of asylum was so well-known that the analogy was at once understood. Mommsen,⁵⁰ we all know, absolutely denied a right of asylum in Rome, whilst Wissowa⁵¹ admitted that in isolated cases

among the Greek deities received in Rome, the existence of such an institution might be allowed. Without going more closely into the basis of these two assertions,⁵² we may discuss a single case, in which a measure, like that observed in Tarracina, is proved also for Rome. By it there was granted to those, who had before been slaves or without rights, freedom, and with it citizenship under the form of the claim of asylum.

We are referring to an institution that plays a part in the primitive history of Rome and that has therefore been hitherto dismissed by scholars as a mere invention, the asylum of Romulus, which the founder of the city himself, in the legend placed, on the saddle of the Capitoline Hill *inter duos lucos*. In historical times, it is true, the place might not be trodden, a fact reported also of the later asylum of Divus Julius (Dio Cassius 47, 19, 3). But it is quite unallowable to assume that this was always the case for the asylum of the Capitol. When Livy speaks of a *locus, qui nunc est saeptus* (1, 8, 5), a contrast is necessarily implied with an earlier state of affairs, when the asylum was still accessible. Both the name, *asylum*, and that feature of the legend of Romulus that makes slaves and fugitives of all kinds collect on the spot and form the earliest population of the city, presuppose that the place, with which they are associated, was once a real asylum. Livy's report of the causes of the war with the Sabines (1, 30, 5; the Sabines complain, *suos . . . in lucum*⁵³ *confugisse ac Romae retentos*) presupposes that it was accessible.⁵⁴

To-day we can fit this asylum into a wider context. Greek origin seems at once to be guaranteed by the name *asylum*, which was so closely linked to the region 'between the two groves'. But we have also a direct tradition. When Romulus gained adherents to his new settlement by receiving those who had taken refuge in the asylum into the body of his new state, he appealed, according to Plutarch (*Rom.* 9), to a *μαρτεῖον πνθόχρηστον*. If we take this statement seriously, the Delphic oracle stood behind the institution of the asylum. Only in the last few years have we found something that can be brought in for comparison and that puts the meaning of the information in its true light.

The asylum of Romulus differs from that which we have discussed in that it served a definite political purpose. Romulus wants to get men for his new city and therefore opens his asylum. His action was by no means singular; Livy assures us expressly that he acted *vetere consilio condentium urbes, qui obscuram atque humilem conciendo ad se multitudinem natam e terra sibi prolem ementiebantur* (1, 8, 5).⁵⁵ From this we may take it as at least probable that similar institutions occur in other cases at the foundation of new cities. In these cases, too, we find that ruling influence of the Delphic oracle that met us in the words of Plutarch.

R. Herzog,⁵⁶ dealing with the Hicetides of Aeschylus, has made the weighty observation that out of the right of *ἰκετεία* a right of settlement must have arisen. To the Danaides, seeking protection, is granted a *μετοικεῖν σὺν ἀσύλλῃ βροτῶν* (609 f.), the king and all the citizens offering themselves as *προστάται* (963 f.).⁵⁷ Herzog then thought that he could recognize a similar state of law in the law of asylum at Cos which he was the first to edit. This would become very important if his further guess should prove to be correct, according to which the asylum of the temple of Asclepius on Cos was derived from an utterance of the Delphic oracle. But beyond a probability we cannot yet go.

Clearer is the language of the recently discovered sacred law of Cyrene,⁵⁸ the character of which as utterance of the god of Delphi is assured. At its close there is question of three kinds of *ἰκέσιοι*; the one that concerns us is the second, where there is talk of a *ἰκέσιος*, who sits *ἐν δαμοσίῳ ἱερῷ* (§18). In return for certain exactly determined obligations, that may be carried on to his posterity, a *τελετή* is granted him. It has been realized⁵⁹ that the fact that the obligation can be hereditary implies that the suppliant together with his whole family was taken into the sacred company. And, since it was to a *δαμόσιον ἱερόν* that the *ἰκέσιος* has turned, it must be that the acceptance into the sacred company coincided with acceptance into the state.⁶⁰ The claiming of the protection of a sacred site, then, and the *τελετή* resulting from it, was the form under which a stranger with all his descendants was adopted into the community and the state. The analogy with the conditions in Rome seems

here to be palpable.⁶¹ A ceremony of dedication is not, it is true, expressly recorded for Rome, but the fact that that claim to asylum originally gave the fugitive into the possession of the god, and so implied a consecration of him, is enough to establish the agreement. To this we may add, that not only could this ordinance in both cases appeal to the Delphic oracle, but that other indications lead us to Apollo. That the *δαμόσιον ἱερόν* in Cyrene means a temple of this god has long since been observed,⁶² and again the question of the god to whom the asylum of Romulus belonged leads us to the circle of the Delphic Apollo.

The evidence on this point is not unambiguous. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 2, 15, 4, explains that he does not know a god of the asylum. But Plutarch, *Rom.* 9, speaks of an *ἀσύλαιος θεός*, thus implying that a divine owner was in existence. We are enabled to advance a step further by a note which is preserved in the larger Servius on *Aen.* 2, 761.

In the commentary of Servius himself there is discussion of the institution of the asylum in general. Not all temples possessed this right, but only those, *quibus consecrationis lege concessum est*. The oldest application of the principle, we hear, was in Athens, where a sanctuary was opened for the children of Heracles; this was the model that Romulus followed. At this point the addition by the so-called Interpolator sets in; of the asylum of Romulus it is said that the *deus Lucoris, sicut Piso ait*, has it under his charge. This is one of those valuable notes that the enlarged commentary so often contains. We have no right to question the name of Piso as authority; that the remains of antiquarian and mythological learning, which are preserved under his name, belong to the annalist and not to a later antiquarian of the same name, need hardly be maintained at length to-day.⁶³

The *deus Lucoris* has always been identified with the Delphic Lykoreus.⁶⁴ The form of the name does not give any difficulty. The variant *Λυκώρης*, implied in *Lucoris*, beside *Λυκωρεός* and *Λυκωρός* (Paus. 10, 6, 2; *Etylm. Magn.* p. 571, 74), goes back to a widespread change between these three suffixes.⁶⁵ The decisive point is that the Delphic hero appears as lord of an asylum. Lykoreia, lying on

the heights of Parnassus, was the place where Deucalion, it was said, moored his ship (Apoll. 1, 7, 2; Lucian, *Tim.* 3; Schol. Pind. *Olymp.* 9, 64); it was from here that Delphi was subsequently founded.⁶⁶ According to another version it was at this spot that men took refuge before the flood, following the howling of wolves (Paus. 10, 6, 2). From of old, then, the place was a sanctuary. The connexion with wolves just referred to is the more important, inasmuch as it is unmistakable in the name of the 'wolf-hill', Lykoreia, and its eponym, Lykoreus. That the wolf was the animal of the fugitive, the exile and the outcast from human society has long been known.⁶⁷ The cult of Zeus Lykoreios, founded by Deucalion, is therefore also called the cult of Zeus Phyxios, who was worshipped as helper of fugitives.⁶⁸ In view of the nearness of Delphi it is of importance that the wolf is connected with Apollo. As protector of the banished, he bears the name Lykeios,⁶⁹ and in Delphi itself stood a bronze wolf in the neighbourhood of the temple (Paus. 10, 14, 7; Plut., *Pericl.* 21).⁷⁰

From this point of approach it no longer seems an accident that the Capitoline asylum is connected with Romulus. Like the slaves and criminals whom, in the legend, he assembled in the sanctuary that he established, he and his brother, Remus, had themselves once been banished from the community. As a new-born child he had been exposed and suckled by a she-wolf. Here we come yet again on the wolf, and in other points, too, Romulus is connected with it.⁷¹ The wolf-god Mars was his father, and in the Lupercal, the 'wolf-cave' of the wolf-shaped Faunus at the foot of the Palatine, he was reared; a *lupa*, that is, originally, not a *meretrix*, but Acca Larentia, herself in wolf's shape, is said to have been his foster-mother. On the Capitol, in the neighbourhood of the asylum, stood the ancient sculpture, that survives to-day, of the she-wolf, which is often mentioned in literature (Cic., *Cat.* 3, 8, 19; *de div.* 1, 12, 20; Dio Cassius 37, 9). We cannot here go into a long discussion either of the wolf-form or of the legend of Romulus. We need only remark that this appears not only with the heroic ancestor of Rome and with the god of the asylum, Lykoreus, but also with another deity, whom we have met in possession

of an asylum or of an institution that makes us think of one.

To Feronia is dedicated the *picus Feronius* (Fest. p. 197 M.), just as is the *picus Martius* to Mars, and he again stands in close connexion with the wolf.⁷² The *hirpi Sorani*, again, who as priests of the wolf-shaped Etruscan god of death⁷³ are themselves named after the wolf, are designated by Strabo (5, p. 226) as servants of Feronia. We have shown in another place that this notice has been unjustly rejected.⁷⁴ Feronia seems to have been actually thought of as wife of the god of Soracte. Just as in other contexts (Dion. Hal. 3, 22, 1) she is identified with Persephone, she meets us on a fresco of Corneto⁷⁵ as *phersipnei* beside the wolf-god as queen of the underworld.⁷⁶

From this a further fact gains in importance. In the year 192 B.C. a shrine was founded to Veiovis in the immediate neighbourhood of the asylum *inter duos lucos*.⁷⁷ Everything points to this god belonging to the underworld and to his being represented, as his name suggests, as the counterpart of the sky-god Jupiter. So, too, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (2, 10, 3) renders Veiovis by *Ζεὺς καταχθόνιος*.⁷⁸ We have no occasion to believe that his temple was identical with the asylum; we must in fact suppose that the asylum was older than the foundation of the temple (see below, p. 263). But that a connexion of some kind existed between Veiovis and the asylum (cp. Ovid, *Fasti* 3, 428 f.) is shown at once by the law, going back to Romulus, according to which he who offended against the relation of clientship must be put to death, *ὡς θῦμα καταχθονίου Διός* (Dion. Hal., loc. cit. 1 f.).⁷⁹ The god, who watched over the sanctity of clientship, can hardly be separated from the neighbouring sanctuary, to which the slaves fled from the caprice of their masters. Yet one more connexion is revealed. In the Capitoline shrine of Veiovis stood a statue of the god, cut out of cypress wood.⁸⁰ It represented him with arrows in his hand and a goat at his side, thus attaching itself to a well-known type of the Greek Apollo (cp. Gellius 5, 12, 12).⁸¹ This is the more important, because the cypress was not only the tree of death, but also stood in connexion with the god. Kyparissos, who because of his sorrow for his dead

stag was turned into the tree that bears his name, is for one branch of the tradition a love of Apollo. If Veiovis, then, was assimilated to him, it reminds us of the fact that the god, who had Feronia as his consort on Soracte and to whom in conjunction with her the *hirpi Sorani* vowed their service, was later equated with Apollo.⁸² Once again we meet that same power, in whose circle Lykoreus belongs, the wolf-god and the lord of the banished.

The question when the Delphic hero came to Rome, hard as it is to answer, must yet be essayed. The meaning of the institution in itself demands that the asylum of Romulus should be placed as early as possible. Only when the community was still in its beginnings could importance be attached to bringing increase of citizens to the city by access from outside. We are expressly told in one passage that the Romans themselves regarded any form of asylum that appeared in their history as something valid for a very ancient period, and only for that. According to Dio Cassius (47, 19, 13) there was voted to the temple dedicated to the consecrated dictator, Caesar, in 42 B.C., a right of asylum, such as only the gods who had been introduced at the time of Romulus had received. Whether or no such a right ever actually existed within the earliest circle of gods, it is described here as a peculiarity of the earliest epoch of religion, and the exceptional character of the honours allotted to the great dead is thereby illustrated.⁸³

Finally, a high antiquity for the asylum of Romulus is suggested by the history of Apollo himself. As there is no doubt that he was accepted in Rome about the turn of the sixth and fifth centuries, there is nothing against and much in favour of the view that the institution of the asylum, too, was adopted in very early times. The same argument would apply to the Lykoreus, who belonged to the circle of Apollo.

The rôle played by the Delphic Apollo deserves a special word of note. Livy 1, 56, 5 knows of an embassy which went to the god shortly before the fall of the last king. According to a notice in Cicero, *de rep.* 2, 24, 44, Tarquinius Superbus is said to have followed the custom of his Greek forebears (*institutis eorum, a quibus ortus erat*; cp. 2. 19, 34)

and sent gifts to Delphi. Whatever we may think of the historical correctness of this news, such a gift from Rome is expressly recorded a century later after the conquest of Veii,⁸⁴ and, as regards date, that first embassy of the Etruscan king finds its counterpart. Herodotus 1, 167 reports a penitential embassy sent by the citizens of Caere (*Ἀγυλλαῖοι*) after the battle of Alalia to the god of Delphi. In consequence of it they founded in his honour a *γυμνακὸς καὶ ἱππικὸς ἀγών*. More, in Delphi itself the city of Caere builds a treasury of its own, and the same is recorded of the Etruscan Spina.⁸⁵

A very remarkable testimony to the early importance of Delphi in the sphere of Italy has been supplied by the most recent research into the origin of the Etruscan alphabet. F. Sommer⁸⁶ has tried to prove that its model was not, as has been hitherto supposed, in Cumæ, but in central Greece, probably in the alphabet of Delphi. Sommer has tried to adduce as fresh support for his view his successful demonstration that the Etruscan sign for *f*, that has till now counted as of Lydian origin, also goes back to the same model.⁸⁷ One feels tempted to think at once of a 'sacred' origin for the Etruscan script, that is, one determined by the Delphic oracle.

The appearance of a Delphic hero in Rome, then, fits into a wider context. The fame of Delphi began with the seventh century. It soon rose to an imposing influence, not excluding politics, and as early as the sixth century its reputation spread beyond the boundaries of the Greek world proper. Croesus of Lydia repeatedly sought its counsel and paid for it with many gifts. We see now that the Italian west, as well, experienced the influence of the Pythian Apollo in early times. The unity of the ancient world, the early community of Greek and Italian history, comes once more into evidence in this case.

At the risk of losing ourselves in mere conjectures, we must finally venture on a guess.⁸⁸ At the beginning of this volume we defined the importance that the foundation of the Capitoline temple has for Roman religion. What came with it to Rome was, in the last resort, the Greek house of the god, the Greek cult-image and the Greek ritual in general in the

games and in the entertainment of the gods. In detail, it is true, the mediation of Etruria could in every case be proved. The shrine itself was built by the Etruscan kings, and so too were the ground-plan and siting based on Etruscan models. We had to emphasize the fact that the triad there worshipped, Jupiter, Juno and Minerva, came from Etruria. If we now ask where in Greek cult this triad finds its counterpart, the only example that we can point to is the trinity of Zeus, Hera and Athena, whom Pausanias (10, 5, 1 f.) attests as deities of the Phocian community.⁸⁹ We are once again in the sphere of Delphi, in the land from which Lykoreus, too, springs.

This can hardly be accidental. For there can be no doubt that the deities of the Etruscan triad were as early as the sixth century equated with the corresponding Greek deities.⁹⁰ This is raised to the point of assured fact by the reflection that the cult-images of the triad, which were made by Etruscan artists, could only have been created on a Greek pattern. In Satricum in Latium, as we have already observed, the excavations have revealed the remains of a group in the temple of the Mater Matuta, which represents the triad and may give us a general impression of how they were conceived at the turn of the sixth and fifth centuries. The Greek model is so unmistakable that the question at once arises, whether the Etruscan triad itself does not go back to a corresponding Greek cult. The thought of the three Phocian deities is suggested not only by the fact already mentioned, that they represent the one and only similar group on the Greek side, but also by the numerous and very ancient connexions of Etruria with Delphi and central Greece that have been observed. Into these contexts an early reception of the Phocian triad, Zeus, Hera and Athena, would very well fit. We might see a confirmation in the fact that the hero Lykoreus, who himself came from Delphi, possessed in Rome a site in the immediate neighbourhood of the Capitoline temple. We can no longer deny the possibility that this hero came with the Capitoline triad from Etruria to Rome and, further, that the Etruscans took over both the Phocian triad and the god of the asylum in very early times from Delphi.⁹¹

The guess here suggested seems to find confirmation, if we turn our eyes to the earliest history of Delphi.⁹² Lykoreia was a place of refuge and a Yaila for the village of Pytho, which itself belonged to the stronghold of Krisa. Shrine and citadel were then in the exclusive possession of the Phocians; thereby they commanded both main roads that passed in the neighbourhood of Delphi. It was only after the earliest of the Sacred Wars that Delphi was placed immediately under the Amphietyony.⁹³ This was very much against the wishes of the Phocians, who even in after-days could never quite get over the loss. If, then, it was the deities of the Phocian community that found their way through the mediation of Delphi into Etruria and there meet us as the triad, Jupiter, Juno and Minerva, the adoption can only have taken place at a time when the power of Krisa, and with it that of the Phocians, over Delphi was still unbroken. When, later, the Delphian priests coved no longer belong to this people, but maintained their Cretan origin,⁹⁴ ideas were fundamentally changed. Here, as often,⁹⁵ the conditions in Italy mirror an older age, which on the Greek side we can only recognize in faint traces.

In point of chronology, too, the result can be confirmed. If the Etruscan triad was introduced into Rome even before the Capitoline temple was finished, it must have been considerably older in the Etruscan motherland. With this we get back into the age before the first Sacred War, into the time of the Phocian hegemony. Finally, one more piece of evidence comes in to assure our result; Strabo 9, p. 418, tells us that Krisa, before it was destroyed, levied rich dues on the ships and pilgrims who came from Sicily and Italy.⁹⁶ There existed then, we may infer, a vigorous intercourse with the west; had not the Locrians of the Crisaean Gulf planted a colony of their own on the east coast of Bruttium, Locri Epizephyrii? (Strabo 6, p. 250; cp. Servius, *Aen.* 3, 899).⁹⁷ This trait fits like the rest into the picture that has grown before us.

Chapter IV

ITALY AND ROME

OF the relations of the Greeks of Italy and the Latins to one another at the beginning of the sixth century we are permitted in some measure to judge by a few pieces of archaeological evidence, which are fortunately of an unmistakable character. They show that conditions were not seriously altered from those of the earlier period.

We have to mention in the first place the shrine of Mater Matuta at Conca, the ancient Satricum, lying not far from the coast between Rome and Antium. The excavations are not very satisfactorily published,¹ but the little that we do know permits us to recognize a stratification, the sequence of which is of general importance for the contemporary culture of Latium and Rome. The earliest building was a simple 'cella' of Etruscan character, adorned with a terra-cotta decoration of like origin. The sacrificial trench that went with it contained a *stips votiva* which, to judge from its contents, corresponded to the old princely graves of Caere and Praeneste. About the middle of the sixth century the older building was replaced by a temporary one, the terra-cottas of which point to Campania;² we may guess that it was made by emigrant craftsmen from that land. At the beginning of the fifth century arises, finally, a third building which, apart from its terra-cotta frieze that belongs to Etrusco-Ionian art, was a regular Greek temple. Rising not on a podium, but on steps, it was provided with a colonnade, possibly with a double one.

At the beginning of the fifth century Greek architecture is advancing in Latium at the expense of the Etruscan. In the immediate neighbourhood of Rome rises a Doric peripteral temple, the most northerly yet known in Italy. Such an advance of the Greek element will hardly have been

confined to architecture. Proof of this may be found in what was happening in Rome at the same period.

According to the tradition, the Etruscan royal house was overthrown in the year 510 B.C. The new organization of the state which took its place did not immediately signify any change in the public cult. The mighty building of the Tarquins on the Capitol was dedicated a year after their expulsion. Greek gods, adopted like Mercurius and the Dioscuri by the way of Etruria, received temples of their own in the following decades. In one case only is there an indication that the attempt was made to throw off the suzerainty of the neighbouring people on this domain, too, as it had already been thrown off on the political.³

In the year 496 B.C. a temple on the Aventine was vowed and dedicated three years later to the triad Ceres, Liber and Libera, who corresponded to the Greek deities, Demeter, Dionysos and Kore. At the first glance it fitted exactly into the frame of the other Greek cults, which had come to Rome through the mediation of Etruria. The ground-plan of the temple was of Etruscan character. Again, in the way in which the deities are formed into a trinity, we seem to see agreement with similar divine groups of Etruscan origin. Cicero describes Liber and Libera as 'children' (*liberi*) of the earth-mother (*de nat. deor.*, 2, 62); this shows at least how one might conceive the relation of the three deities to one another.⁴ Such an idea is foreign to Roman religion, in historical times, at least. We do, however, find something similar in the Samnite cult of Ceres at Agnone, where Libera as 'daughter' has her counterpart,⁵ and, above all, in the religion of Etruria. Terra-cottas and votive statues show a mother-goddess, with one or two children on her arm; for Latium we have to think especially of the finds from the temple of the Mater Matuta at Satricum.⁶ In the same form appears the goddess of Capua, who was probably called **Damosia* and was identical with the Spartan *Δαμολα* (*Δαμολία*) and with the Damia, who was worshipped both at Tarentum and later at Rome.⁷ Fortuna, too, at least in the form in which she was worshipped at her chief seat of worship, Praeneste, was the foster-mother of the two divine children, Juppiter Puer and Juno Virgo.⁸

There is one final piece of evidence that points in the same direction. If we consider the position of Ceres, Liber and Libera in the cult of the state as a whole, it seems to be unmistakable that as triad they are opposed to the heavenly triad of Jupiter, Juno and Minerva. Analogous to the Etruscan triad of the heavenly powers, the powers of the earth receive in a group of deities a sort of representative centre.

But although once again a connexion with the religion of Etruria results, yet the cult of Ceres, Liber and Libera means something different in principle from the former reception of Greek deities through the mediation of a neighbouring people. For the first time an immediate connexion with Greece is evident. This trinity is the first cult that was introduced by the new Sibylline oracles.⁹ The priestesses were accordingly drawn from the Greek cities of Campania¹⁰ and Southern Italy. Cicero again speaks expressly of a cult of mysteries (*de nat. deor.* 2, 62), and this has its counterpart in the fact that we find at Cumae as early as the fifth century a separate cemetery for the *βεβαρχευμένοι*, that is, for the initiated.¹¹ Finally, to adorn the temple, two Greek masters, Gorgasos and Damophilos, were called in: they were the very first of whom the Roman tradition has any knowledge.

The importance of these innovations is obvious. They are an attempt to break through the supremacy of Etruria in the religious field and to establish direct connexion with the Greeks. As in the political field, the striving after autonomy is unmistakable. Men wished to rid themselves of the forms that had been inherited and had become fixed; this meant that the earlier development had now passed its meridian. With this casting off of the foreign tutelage and the striving after direct access to Greece appears a more vigorous and persistent emphasis of the national character; in this we see the workings of those two balanced opposite tendencies which we emphasized at the outset, the intensive acquisition of the Greek element going hand in hand with a correspondingly enhanced expansion of the native character.

The conjecture has already been forced upon us that the decisive acts of the period of the Tarquins, the adoption of the Greek temple and cult-image on the one hand, and of the classical world of gods proper on the other, were the

result of a deliberate and singly directed will. It was with full intent that a seat was prepared in Rome for the grand creations of the Greek spirit, an essential impulse being given by those creations themselves in their perfection and their wealth of meaning. Something quite distinct is implied in the introduction of the triad of Ceres, Liber and Libera. They are set by the tradition in connexion with the occurrence of a famine (Dion. Hal. 6, 17) ; people saw in this a *prodigium*, that is to say, a sign that the good understanding with the gods (*pax deorum*) had been disturbed. The Sibylline oracles counselled that the Greek deities, Demeter, Dionysos and Kore, should be appeased ; a temple was, therefore, vowed to them. The triad of 496, then, represents the beginning of a long series of new cults of the state which, one and all, were similarly adopted. In every case there is required an expression of the divine will, which then has binding force. The gods reveal their mood through definite occurrences ; man has to attend to them and do his part.

Here we find at work a conception quite distinct from the earlier. Free, deliberate action is no longer possible on man's own initiative ; everything done represents the completion of that which has been spoken by the gods (*fatum*). Only at such a behest can an innovation in the state-cult be adopted, a Greek deity be received.

In this bondage to the divine will is expressed a temper, which belongs to a realm that was primitive in Rome. The divine reveals itself to man in definite indications, which have binding force for him and by which he must regulate his action. It is on the contrast of such suggestions and an 'attention' to them that the conception of *religio* is based. The fundamental importance of this and of the conduct, which we have spoken of in connexion with it, is fully recognized.¹² In the case just discussed it won a new field of application.

The introduction of the triad, Ceres, Liber and Libera, then, shows two faces. Besides the immediate connexion with the Greeks, it represents a vigorous and obviously deliberate emphasis of special Roman character. Both are of the greatest moment for the time to come.

1. THE FALL OF THE ANCIENT ITALIAN CULTURE

If we take up one of the latest descriptions of the history of Roman religion, written since the work of Wissowa, we usually find, following on the treatment of the deities of ancient Rome, a section on the 'Etruscizing and Hellenizing Period', which extends from the end of the kingly period to Augustus. A vast period, filled with the most various events, is thus brought under one common heading. All that takes place inside that epoch must necessarily appear as an almost homogeneous whole. This may once, purely empirically, have possessed certain advantages in practice. But, on a closer view, we see that such an arrangement does no sort of justice to the variety of the historical development. Its course is very much less direct, the working of forces against and through one another is much too complicated and full of meaning, to admit of being expressed by such a scheme.

For one thing, the earliest order of gods in Rome includes a series of Greek deities. It is not their mere reception, then, that can supply the basis for such a division into periods, but only the form under which this reception took place. After the introduction of Ceres, Liber and Libera, Greek deities were only taken over by direct contact. This is particularly true of the great influx that set in with the second half of the third century B.C. This immediate adoption, without parallel in earlier times, represents a fundamental change of attitude to Greece as a model of culture; for this point we may refer back to what we have already said.

Not less important is another conclusion, to which every careful observer of the Republican period must come. Wissowa¹³ has already pointed out that the series of the earliest Greek deities is separated by an interval of nearly two centuries from a second series, that begins soon after the year 300 B.C. All that immediately follows the reception of the triad, Ceres, Liber and Libera, the foundation of the temples of Mercurius (495), of Castor (484) and of Apollo on the Flaminian meadows (481), implies no fresh adoption, but only the equipment with buildings of cults received in earlier times. The same is true of other insti-

tutions, as, for example, of the *lectisternium* of the year 399 and its successors,¹⁴ if the guess that we have made about the age of this practice has hit the mark. So, too, the embassies to Delphi that were sent, for example, on the occasion of the conquest of Veii¹⁵ or during the Samnite Wars, find their counterparts in earlier times.

The greater part of the fifth and the whole of the fourth century, then, represent a hiatus in history. We can scarcely escape the inference that Rome in this epoch was cut off from Greek development. We find confirmation of this view in the fact that the phenomenon can be observed not only in the realm of religion, but universally. With the powerful influx of Greek deities and Greek art it would be inconceivable if sooner or later, in the course of the fifth and fourth centuries, the influence of the Greek language had not made itself felt; the more so, as in very early times, perhaps the iambic trimeter, certainly the catalectic trochaic tetrameter (as *versus quadratus*), had found admittance to Rome. In this and in the reception of the already mentioned primitive games of Dionysos lay a starting-point for the adoption of scenic shows, and yet it remained unused. This, too, is only intelligible on the assumption that after the first deep penetration of Rome by Greek elements a long and equally thorough separation ensued.

All that was taken over in the course of the fourth century in the way of games in Rome points invariably to Italian peoples in the immediate neighbourhood, never to Greek culture. Livy describes in a well-known chapter (7, 2), how in 364 Etruscan *ludiones* came to Rome. In the same place he mentions the incoming of the Atellan farce that also came from Etruria. As its name of *ludi Osci* shows, it came to Rome through the mediation of the Oscans of Campania. In the same context belongs the *ludus talaris*,¹⁶ which used to be erroneously associated with *μαγῳδία* and *λυσῳδία*. It was a dance, carried on to the accompaniment of cymbals and castanets. The absence of singing and recitation reminds us of those *ludiones*, who *sine carmine ullo, sine imitandorum carminum actu . . . ad tibicinis modos saltantes haud indecoros motus more Tusco dabant*. The wall-paintings of Etruria supply the illustration of these

dances. Everyone can conjure up the representations of such tombs as the Tomba delle leonesse, the Tomba del triclinio and Giustiniani. The reliefs of the grave-cippi of Etruria also supply a wealth of evidence.

Rome, then, in the fifth and fourth centuries, took up a position of isolation in face of Greek culture. A gap of more than a hundred years separated the two cultures. This is perhaps more clearly expressed in the realm of religion than elsewhere and certainly set in earlier, but it can also be demonstrated in the fields of politics and economic life.¹⁷ The consequences of this hiatus are obvious enough. Whilst Rome stood in connexion with archaic Greece and then again with Hellenism, and gladly adopted foreign influences, the classical period with its mighty creations could gain no footing there.¹⁸ To realize this is of fundamental importance for other things than the course of the history of the earlier religion of Rome; we shall have to return to it when we discuss the age of Augustus.

We have still to give an explanation of how this came to be. In the very earliest times the Etruscans had been the bearers of the Greek influence. Then, sharing this function with others, they had by the second half of the sixth century gained a position of increasing monopoly. And this was true not only for Rome and central Italy, but beyond them. The rôle of the Etruscans in world-history is revealed symbolically in the fact that the name of Greek seems to have reached the Germans, too, through their mediation. If a conjecture of H. Jacobsohn is correct,¹⁹ the name of *Graecus*, Gothic *Krēks*, reached the German peoples of the Alps by this way. That the Germanic runes have their model in the alphabets of northern Etruria may, after the researches of C. Marstrander and M. Hammarström, be taken as established.²⁰

In view of the overwhelming importance that Etruria enjoyed as a mediator of Greek culture at the close of the period of the kings, the development of Rome, as we have just characterized it, is only intelligible if it was accompanied by a corresponding development on the side of Etruria. In the absence of an Etruscan literature, we can only follow the course of events from the monuments. It

has recently been emphasized ²¹ with justice that the second half of the fifth and the fourth century represent in art a period of stagnation for Etruria (as for central Italy, as a whole). Men clung to the models supplied by archaic Greek art; they, and not the works of the Greek prime, gained for Etruscan art a classical importance. It was only with the turn of the fourth and third centuries that a new influx began. Hellenism breaks over the borders of Etruria and continues in immediate succession the earlier practice of art on the pure archaizing model.

It is more difficult to estimate the history of Etruscan religion. On various occasions C. van Essen ²² has expressed the view that the great gods of Greek origin all go back to the archaic age, whilst the demonology that is especially characteristic of the people rose in this precise epoch that we are discussing. From this it seems to follow that after the early, animated intrusion of the Greek world of gods a later period of greater restraint followed. The formation of independent Etruscan deities and the attention to native Etruscan character that is implied in it will soon find its parallels on the Roman side.

On the Roman, as on the Etruscan side, then, common tendencies in development seem to emerge. In discussing their causes we shall have to distinguish between certain special cases and the general factor. In regard to Etruscan art, for example, it remains to be considered whether in its inner nature it was at all capable of deeply comprehending the classical art of Greece; the very works, in which such a comprehension was now and then attempted, ²³ seem to tell a clear tale. But we cannot answer these and similar questions here. All that concern us are the universal and generally valid traits. Among these we are disposed to attach particular weight to the political development.

The expulsion of the Tarquins robbed the Etruscan hegemony of its chief support in Latium; the expedition of Porsenna, if it is historical at all, had no more than a passing importance. From Hiero of Syracuse the Etruscan power at sea sustained a severe blow. After the middle of the fifth century the Etruscan lordship in Campania crashed to the ground. Soon afterwards followed the incursion of the

Gauls into the valley of the Po; even before that Rome had begun the attack from the south. Veii and the chief city of the Etruscans in North Italy, Melpum, are said in one legend to have fallen on the same day. To complete the disaster, Syracuse, as a new great power under Dionysius the First, began an offensive policy, which dealt painful blows to the reputation of Etruria as a power at sea.

The Etruscans were thus practically thrown back on their home, in the narrowest sense. The connexion with the Greek south of Italy was restricted at sea and quite cut off by land, after Latium and Campania had withdrawn themselves from Etruscan influence. The separation had the more drastic effects, inasmuch as the same fate at the same time overtook the Greeks of South Italy. The same people which had overthrown the Etruscans in Campania, the Samnites, poured over Lucania and the Bruttian peninsula and brought destruction on the glorious circle of Greek cities in rapid succession. Of the inhabitants of Posidonia, the later Paestum, Aristoxenus reports (in *Athen.* 14, 682 A), that they had changed their language and other institutions, 'yet they still celebrate one of the Hellenic festivals, at which they gather together and recall to mind those old names and institutions: then they lament and weep together and go their ways'.

There were but few that succeeded in maintaining themselves and their Greek character—Naples ^{23a} and, in the farthest south, Tarentum, and one or two cities in its neighbourhood. But even Tarentum had had in 474 to suffer a heavy defeat from the Illyrian Iapyges, which put an end to its colonial expansion on the Sallentine peninsula. The appearance of help from abroad could bring no lasting relief.

With the decline of the Greeks of South Italy and the fall of the Etruscan power, the two pillars, on which the culture of Italy had up to then essentially rested, collapsed. The ancient Italian period, which ran parallel to archaic Greece, with a short time-lag, was now at an end and a new age began, the decisive features of which only gradually began to define themselves.

Looking back once more, we see a unified and solid picture

offered us by the culture of ancient Italy. It is unitary, not only in including all the peoples of Italy, but also in its nature and its foundations. Any discussion of it within the frame of a history of Roman religion means restriction to the barest necessities.

We have just observed that the Italian culture was an archaic one; that implies also that it was carried on by an aristocratic society. It seems to have been much the same in Italy as in Greece, where the age of the nobility implied a certain solidarity of the Greek world. The nobility represented not only its own political privileges, but also a clearly defined form of life, a uniformity of view of the world and of custom. It 'felt itself as a common higher class of the nation'.²⁴

In a purely external way a certain solidity is attested by the widespread 'Etruscan' form of naming, which presupposes a unified stratum of *gentes*, perhaps even kinship between them. The social factor tells a clear story. Everywhere the possession of landed property forms the basis upon which the existence of a warlike nobility is built. The mounted hoplite (occasionally with two horses)²⁵ and the driver of the war-chariot belong exclusively to this class. The footmen, consisting of the clients, had obviously here, as in the world of Homer, no task but to be 'walls of the battle' (*Il.* 4, 299). Among the nobles, if we may judge by the Etruscan grave-paintings, athletic contests played an important part; great games of many kinds, comparable to the Greek, are inseparable from them.

Decisive is the fact that in Italy, as in Greece, the existence of this noble society went hand in hand with strong religious connexions. Law was originally confined to this circle; we have already proved this for one particular case—that of the right of asylum. Even after the first codification of law, which is set by the Roman tradition in the middle of the fifth century, the method of procedure, for example, long remained a secret of the college of *pontifices*. In its hands also lay the earliest official record of history, the *Annales Maximi*, as they were afterwards called. Art stands immediately in the service of cult or else devotes itself to legend, mostly, it is true, Greek legend. Its repre-

sentations take possession of all and sundry, down to the objects of every-day use. This can only be understood if we assume that the age could live and move among such things.

Many other threads run to and fro. For the athletics of the nobility of which we have spoken, the festivals of the gods were from the first the nursery; they remained so in this epoch. By them stands the funeral-show, which is inseparable from the burial of the nobleman and from the cult of dead ancestors in general. Above all, if we may judge by Roman conditions, the priesthoods were originally, one and all, in the hands of the nobility. Gentile origin is unmistakable for a number of priestly associations in Rome, but also, for example, in the Umbrian Iguvium.²⁴ Among the gods themselves the gods of single *gentes* claim a comparatively large space; it was only in course of time that they developed into gods of the state. Others, like Hercules or, even more, the knightly twins, Castor and Pollux, were perfectly adapted to serve as divine patterns for the nobles; in Rome their connexion with the knights existed from the very first.²⁷ Of a religious centre of Greece in the aristocratic age and of its importance for Italy, too, we have spoken in connexion with the Apollo of Delphi. Further, we are beginning to realize, if our earlier arguments were not deceptive, the existence of an early Italian saga and of a world of heroes attached to it, in the forms of which the nobility, here as elsewhere, recognized their models and their origin.²⁸ The picture is rounded off by a legendary tradition of history and by the existence of *carmina*, which sang the *laudes clarorum virorum* and went back some centuries behind the time of Cato (Cicero, *Brutus* 19).²⁹

2. THE RACIAL CULTURES. THE RISE OF ROME

It is significant for the time that was to come that the similarity of culture in ancient Italy allowed room for national differentiation between the several races. This distinction as against the earlier conditions is, of course, gradual and not fundamental. But it denotes the necessary condition for the ability of Rome to subject Italy to herself

and stamp it with her individual mark. When Rome in battle with the peoples of Italy had pushed up into the first place politically, she found about her only a series of cultures, limited in space, no closed realm of culture. Thus she was able to bring her own individuality to fruition without hindrance, was able to endeavour to open up for herself a new relation to Greece and, finally, based on her political hegemony, to make this new cultural character count for the rest of Italy as well. Before it the cultures of the peoples very soon faded away one by one; they sank to provincial rank. Even if it was only the Social War that actually ended the peculiar character of the Oscans and other Italian peoples, this was only the external conclusion of a process that was already decided.

Our survey of that which took the place of the culture of ancient Italy will most effectively begin with the circle of the south of Italy. Here Tarentum still maintained her old position. In art, as also in literature, a decidedly original character was developed; towards the close of the fourth century the native poetry succeeded in rising to literary form. In the neighbouring Apulia the vase-painting indicates a high bloom of culture. On the inscriptions the Messapian language appears in this age, if not for the first time, at least in much greater measure. It failed, it is true, to maintain itself against Oscan and Greek, not to speak of Latin. We must emphasize the fact that the poet Ennius, who was a native of the Messapian Rudiae, could say of himself, *tria corda se habere . . . quod loqui graece et osce et latine sciret*. Messapian, as a language for literature and culture, did not come into account for him.³⁰

In a very much higher degree than in Apulia there was developed in the Oscan and Samnite realm a cultural independence. Just as the state of the Samnites was the only one that could seriously enter into competition with the Roman, so too, in the field of culture, were the Samnites the only worthy rivals. In earlier times they seem even to have been the leading element. The Oscan grave-paintings, the remains of which have been collected by F. Weege,³¹ have nothing fit to compare with them in ancient Rome. The inscriptions show a vigorous standardization of the

language; it is in general use in the state and public life. Whether an Oscan literature existed beside it is still far from clear. Poems in inscriptions all belong to a later date and may imply no more than imitation of the model set by the Romans.³² Whether the native play, the Atellan farce, originally taken over from the Etruscans and then developed independently, attained such literary form as did the Tarentine Phlyaces, is, to say the least, doubtful. Yet it is noteworthy that in a dialogue of the Tarentine Nearchus, beside Plato and the Pythagorean, Archytas, the Samnite, Pontius, father of the victor of Caudium, appears (Cicero, *Cato maior* 12, 41); from other indications, too, an early contact with the Pythagoreans seems to have existed. Greek culture, then, was widely extended among the nobles of Samnium,³³ and with this we may set the fact that on a grave-painting of Ruvo an Oscan choir of girls of the Greek type appears as early as about 400 B.C.³⁴

It is impossible to make a clear cut between Etruscan and Latin culture in the early age, and the same is true of the Oscan and Messapian circle. The grave-painting, just mentioned, shows on Messapian soil a choir in Oscan dress.³⁵ Further, we can establish a number of agreements in language, which are probably to be traced back not to an original Messapian substratum, but to close contact between the two peoples.³⁶ The Greek culture of South Italy also took its part in this process of exchange. We have already referred to the connexion in development between Atellan farce and the Phlyaces. What is characteristic of the dramatic genre, as such, is also characteristic of the language. The vocabulary of the Tarentine farce shows many elements borrowed from Italian dialects, not least from the Illyrian.³⁷ Here, too, we must suppose a close relationship, which was not seriously invalidated even by occasional complications of warfare.

This attachment to the neighbouring culture of the Greeks denotes a serious difference as against Etruria and Rome. In it is expressed not only the difference of geographical position, but also that of national character and historical destiny. The Oscans and Messapians were exposed to the overwhelming influence of Greece before that measure of

native force was available that is the pre-requisite for a really fruitful adoption of it. In central Italy the case was different. For Etruria, indeed, isolation meant the beginning of that senile stiffening to which the nation succumbed. For Rome and Latium, on the other hand, the temporary separation gave room for a pause, which was used to establish the individual character. Through a process of reorganization at home and strengthening abroad, they laid the foundations of their future greatness.³⁸

The main features of our further narrative are now indicated. Here again we must aim at the greatest possible compression, only pointing out what is immediately important for the history of religion.

On the one hand stand the struggles of the orders and the political consolidation within the national borders that followed as their consequence. That stratum of the population that, though personally free, had so far lacked political rights, over which the Etruscan and Roman nobility had risen as a caste, monopolizing rule, now receives its share in the state. Hand in hand with this change goes a shifting of grades, both economical and military. Beside the noble landed proprietors appears the free peasantry, with equal voice in politics. From now on it formed the kernel of the army; as in Greece, the replacement of the armies of knights by the heavy-armed foot meant an epoch-making change.

Whilst the peasant-burghers won that place in the state that had once belonged to the nobility and the *gentes*, an important alteration took place in cult. Not that Roman religion became a 'religion of peasants'—this general characterization has already been rejected. But it was no longer the nobles of the families that gave their own stamp to the outward form of cult. The cult of the state, in principle at least, must henceforth mean the common cult of all citizens; every new god added passed over at once to the community in its entirety.³⁹

Above all, the access that had hitherto been denied the plebs to the priestly colleges was now opened to them. Of signal importance was the *lex Ogulnia* of the year 300 B.C. Originally the office of the *pontifices* and *augures*, like all the

oldest priesthoods, had been open to the patricians only; now this restriction was removed. We are even entitled to go further and suppose that that law did not only determine that the larger half of both those colleges should be assigned to the plebeians, but also that access to other places in the priesthood should be opened to them. Only in the case of the *rex sacrorum*, the three great *flamines* and the *Salii*, did the old restriction remain in force.

It is well-known that, internally as well as externally, the publication of the *Ius Flavianum* coincides with this revolution, an event that 'represented an attack on the secret possessions of the college of *pontifices*'.⁴⁰ As the college itself now became accessible to all, so too did the knowledge of legal process that it had so jealously guarded; it passed out of the circle of the *pontifices* into publicity. The real initiative goes back to Appius Claudius Caecus, whose censorship in the year 312 B.C. seems to have represented a turning-point not only in the history of the conflict of the orders, but also on the side of religion and cult.

We have already observed that the management of *sacra publica* was handed over to definite *gentes*; in this custom the importance of the 'families' within the community found its expression. The abolition of one of the most important of these cults meant an epoch-making change. The service of Hercules at the *Ara Maxima*, which had been managed by the *Potitii* and *Pinarii*, was taken over by the state during the censorship of this same Ap. Claudius Caecus. The circumstances are not clear in their details; ⁴¹ a dying out of the family can at most be assumed for the *Potitii*, for the *Pinarii* it is impossible. Interference by the state with the traditional practice is, to say the least, probable; if so, the new relation of the state to its gods and cults will have found its expression therein.

In conclusion, we may mention two further facts in the history of cult, in which an event in the conflict of the orders is reflected. An important alteration in the Roman system of festivals is most closely linked both in date and in law with the *Licinio-Sextian Rogations*. The *ludi magni*, the games of victory in honour of Capitoline Jupiter, were originally an extraordinary and not a regular festival. If

a guess of Mommsen's is correct,⁴² they first became a regularly recurrent one in the year 366 B.C. The appointment of the curule aediles and their function as *curatores ludorum sollemnium* make it probable that they were entrusted with the yearly celebration of games now tied to a definite date. With the same political event is connected the foundation of the temple of Concordia on the forum (vowed in 367); it meant the symbol of the harmony that was now restored within the body of citizens.⁴³

Beside the conflict of the orders stands the struggle of Rome for supremacy on the peninsula. The severe wars to north and south that set in with the offensive against southern Etruria and, after being only slightly interrupted by the Gallic catastrophe, reached their climax in the Samnite Wars, are reflected with the most complete clarity in the dates of the foundations of temples. After the destruction of Veii, the goddess of the citadel of Veii was brought to Rome by M. Furius Camillus, and to her, as Juno Regina, a temple on the Aventine was dedicated in the year 392 B.C. With the war against the Aurunci is associated the shrine of Juno Moneta on the Arx (vowed in 345, dedicated in 344). By Appius Claudius there was vowed in 296, before the decisive battle with the allied Samnites and Etruscans, a temple to Bellona, and the dedication was completed a few years later.

In the dates of the foundation of temples to Jupiter Stator (vowed in 294 by M. Atilius Regulus) and Jupiter Victor (vowed by Q. Fabius Maximus in 295), as also in the earlier dedication of a temple to Salus (302), is reflected the struggle with the Samnites. By the erection of the temple of Quirinus *in colle* in the year 293 B.C. the consul, L. Papirius Cursor, paid the vow that had been made by his father in war with the same adversaries after the lapse of thirty-two years.

The second Samnite War had already brought Rome into contact with Tarentum; the peace of 304 implied a peace with that city as well. From interference in the Third War, Tarentum was only prevented by her engagements with Agathocles; the foundation of the Roman colony of Venusia was directed at least as much against Tarentum as against

Samnium. Through this intrusion into the affairs of Southern Italy, Rome was again after a long interval brought into contact with the Greek element. Her isolation was interrupted and the way was opened to new influences. The results were not long in showing themselves.

When a severe pestilence visited city and surrounding country, the Sibylline Books, in the year 293, promised relief if the God Asklepios were brought from Epidaurus to Rome. A decisive part in the proceedings fell to the lot of Q. Ogulnius, whom we have already met in connexion with the law that bears his name.⁴⁴ Here, as in other cases—for example, in connexion with the introduction of silver coinage ⁴⁵—he was connected with the fresh introduction of Greek culture to Rome. He stood at the head of the embassy that went to Epidaurus ; it brought back the sacred snake of the god on ship-board, and the snake chose the island of the Tiber as its abode. In remembrance, the island was shaped like a ship travelling up-stream ; there, too, was dedicated the temple of Aesculapius, as he was called in Rome,⁴⁶ in the year 291. The cult itself clearly revealed its origin ; the keeping of snakes and dogs in the shrines, the healing of the sick by incubation, the inscriptions of thanks and the votive offerings, all remind us of the picture that meets us in Epidaurus.⁴⁷ The new god also formed an association with the spring-goddess, Juturna,⁴⁸ in whose shrine also oracles were given by incubation.

The historical importance of the cult of Aesculapius does not merely consist in the fact that it was the first Greek cult, after a long interval, to find admittance to Rome among the gods of the state. It shows also that Rome's sphere of influence had grown so far as to encroach on southern Italy. It is possible that the god had an immediate predecessor in Tarentum,⁴⁹ but, in any case, he was transferred to the Tiber without any such mediation.

One more point in conclusion. When, towards the close of the kingly period, the great Greek deities were received, Greece and Italy still stood at the end of the archaic period. In the interval, Greek culture had lived through its prime, whilst Rome had remained untouched by it. When the connexion was now restored, early Hellenism had set in,

Thus, for central Italy, the most modern phase of Greek culture joined immediately on to the archaic. A god who had won wide acceptance in the course of the fourth and at the beginning of the third centuries,⁵⁰ Asklepios of Epidauros, was received. It was as though fate wished to make good her defect, by sending to Rome a cult that had only reached its prime in the very latest age.

But, above all, what is expressed in this event is the irresistible power of expansion residing in Hellenism. We are standing in an age when, in consequence of the victorious campaigns of Alexander, it spreads over the whole of the Eastern world. It can be no accident that at the same instant it enlarges its sphere in the West as well and, with its penetration into the hitherto closed realm of Rome, begins a new march of triumph. It has been justly observed that in this sense the fresh hellenization of Rome has as its prerequisite the life-work of Alexander.⁵¹

That men's thoughts now went back to that earlier age, when the stream of Greek cults broke for the first time over the Roman boundaries, is a reasonable guess. It is certainly unmistakable that, in the years between the reception of Asklepios and the beginning of the Second Punic War, a whole series of Greek deities who had been admitted at an earlier date received new shrines. We need mention only Tellus (vowed 268) and Flora (288), Volcanus, the various shrines of Hercules, Castor and Pollux, Neptune and Venus.

The Greek custom of the meal of the gods was again taken in hand and received a fresh development. This brings us down, it is true, to a later date, the Hannibalic War. Mainly in its first years, but more or less throughout its whole course, the shock to the whole commonwealth worked itself out in a violent religious excitement.⁵² Even a Polybius, who stands quite aloof from such things as a general rule, could not pass them by on this occasion (8, 112, 6 f.). Among the various ceremonies of expiation—above all, the introduction of new deities, which will occupy us later—appears in the year 217 B.C. a new form of the *lectisternium*. It was offered to six pairs, consisting in each case of a male and a female deity—Jupiter and Juno, Neptunus and

Minerva, Mars and Venus, Apollo and Diana, Vulcanus and Vesta, Mercurius and Ceres. These are the twelve great gods, worshipped at many places in Greece, which from now on appear as a closed circle, in part under native names, in the cult of Rome.⁶³

Chapter V

THE INTRUSION OF HELLENISM

1. INFLUENCES FROM SOUTHERN ITALY

BY the introduction of the cult of Asklepios, Rome had set both feet on the ground of Hellenism. Immediate contact with Greek culture was attained, and contact with the motherland, not with the south of Italy. Yet, in spite of this, it would be perverse to suppose that the earlier state of Roman culture was overcome at a single blow.

True, the influence of Etruria, however considerable it still was, was bound to give ground before the Greek. But it only evacuated the position that it had held step by step. As late as the turn of the third and second centuries the sons of Roman notables were given instruction in Etruscan lore. With this agrees a second fact. In the year 264 B.C., at the funeral of Junius Brutus Pera, gladiatorial games were held for the first time; it was only at a much later date that the state ventured to give them itself at its own public games.¹ The *munus gladiatorium* had its place originally in the cult of the dead in Etruria proper, even if it was by way of Campania, under Etruscan influence, that it first reached Rome.² Roman plastic art of the third to second centuries, a number of specimens of which are now collected in the Museo Mussolini,³ points beyond mistake to the contemporary art of Etruria as its model. The same is true of architecture. The most southerly temple on the Forum Holitorium, as also one of the buildings in the sacred precinct near the 'Argentina' (second century) that has recently been excavated, still shows the after-workings of the Etruscan system.⁴ There are also some linguistic observations—for example, the special treatment of proper names, that seem to show that as late as the age of the Hannibalic War Etruscan was more familiar to the Roman people than Greek.⁵

When twice towards the close of the second century (226 and 216) the sacrifice of a pair of Gauls and Greeks (*Gallus et Galla, Graecus et Graeca*) was accomplished by burial alive, the practice again seems to come from Etruria.⁸ For the religion of that people human sacrifice was as characteristic as it was originally foreign to Rome.⁷

One more piece of evidence deserves mention here. At the close of the *Captivi* of Plautus, Tyndarus, on his return from the stone-quarries, begins his monologue with the words (998 f.): *vidi ego multa saepe picta, quae Acherunti fierent cruciamenta, verum enim vero nulla adaeque Acheruns atque ubi ego fui in lapidicinis*. E. Fraenkel⁸ has shown that here actual paintings are meant, on which the tortures of hell were represented. He reminds us of Etruscan pictures, especially of the frescoes of the Tomba dell' Orco in Tarquiniae. In support of his view we may add that, since he wrote, Etruscan mediation has been made to appear probable for the name of *Acheruns* itself.⁹

But even if the old still maintained itself in many places, the advance of Greek culture was not to be delayed. In the sequel, however, it was not so much from the motherland as from the Greek south of Italy (and occasionally from Sicily) that the main stream flowed.

First in order of importance stands the introduction of the *ludi Tarentini* or, in other words, the Secular Games after the Greek rite.¹⁰ The unfavourable turn taken by the war with Carthage, together with certain unusual signs, had led in the year 249 B.C. to the consultation of the sacred writings. These gave instructions that on three successive nights a sacrifice should be made to Dispatēr and Proserpina. At the base of the Secular festival as such lies the thought that the mischief is thereby prevented from overstepping a certain limit in time. With this it was decreed that a definite epoch, the *saeculum*, the lower limit of which was originally fixed by the death of the last man who was alive at its start, had reached its close; it was accordingly borne to the grave. We have to do, then, with a ritual of death and burial, and that is why the sacrifice is due to the rulers of the underworld, who are none others than the Greek Pluto and his wife, Persephone.¹¹ The transference of a

Greek cult is thus evident, and, as its home, Tarentum is at once indicated by the name of the games; ¹² confirmation comes from a number of other observations.

If we inquire into the importance of this event, it lies less in the actual act of cult, although this was repeated a second time in the year 146 B.C.; it was only by Augustus that the Secular festival was raised to truly decisive importance. We have to think rather of certain historical results that were linked to the new ritual and that counted beyond the narrower sphere of religion.

It is recorded that with the sacrifice to Dis and Proserpina the singing of a *carmen* was associated; it was presumably offered to the same deities. A series of indications suggests that it was performed by a chorus of twenty-seven virgins. It was thus the forerunner of another, incomparably more famous song, that plays an important part in Roman literature—the hymn that was composed by the poet Livius Andronicus, in the distress of the Hannibalic War, for a similarly constituted choir.¹³ The agreement extends even further, for the hymn of 249 seems to have been composed by the same poet.

However that may be, it is obvious that in this year for the first time a choir of virgins of the Greek type, with the *carmen* composed expressly for it, came into action on Roman soil. Not only was it the forerunner of the choir of 207 and of many similar choirs that followed, but it denotes at the same time the introduction of Greek choral lyric in general. Almost a decade before a drama of the Greek kind first took the boards in Rome and Livius Andronicus had a tragic Chorus in Greek metre delivered,¹⁴ a decisive change was enacted within the framework of the cult. Some remarks on general principles are here required.

It has recently been suggested that the really important feature of the introduction of Greek drama in the year 240 is this, that it was due to the senate. Attention has been called to the fact that it was the same senate that twenty-eight years earlier, in 268, had introduced silver coinage in order to facilitate for Roman trade exchange with the Greeks and general contact with them. A religious programme, then, would go side by side with the economic, and the

bearers of this policy would have to be sought on both occasions within the senate itself; in the realm of thought, as in the material, association with the Hellenic world was thus to be attained.¹⁵

Against this we should emphasize the fact that it was not so much that the senate was the bearer of the development, as that it gave the seal of its approval to something that was already accomplished without its help. Long before dramatic games found adoption on the part of the authorities, connexion with Greek Hellenism had become an actual fact through the adoption of the cult of Asklepios of Epidaurus.¹⁶ It agrees with this, that not only was the first Greek choral song taken over in connexion with ceremonies of cult, but also that, outside the Greek sphere proper, we find cult playing its part, as in the archaic epoch, as bearer of the most various cultural gifts.

Just as the game of the Etruscan *ludiones*, which, in the view preserved in Livy (7, 2), formed the germ-cell of the Roman drama, had first entered Rome as a measure of atonement,¹⁷ so too does the native Italian farce, the *fabula Atellana*, appear to have had its place originally in cult, at the games in honour of the dead. With this must be connected the fact that, even later, certain pieces of the *Palliata*, occasionally even of Tragedy and *Praetexta*, were performed on like occasions.¹⁸ An example is the *Adelphoe* of Terence and the second version of his *Hecyra*, which were given in the year 160 at the funeral games of Aemilius Paulus.

What is more, scenic performances were originally indissolubly connected with festivals of the gods. The first Greek drama was played in the year 240-39, probably on the occasion of the *ludi Romani*. This precedent was followed with the other great festivals which arose in the next decades. They all show, beside the circus-games that had originally been everything, an increasing measure of dramatic presentations. This is true not only of the *ludi plebei*, that are first to be proved as a regular annual festival in 216, but also of the *ludi Apollinares*, introduced soon after them (permanent after 208), the *ludi Cereales* (introduced before 202), the *ludi Megalenses* (permanent from 191 onwards), and *Florales* (permanent after 173). How much this con-

nexion with cult was able to influence the form of the drama itself is shown by the *Pseudolus* of Plautus. It was among the games with which M. Junius Brutus, the *praetor urbanus* of 191, celebrated the dedication of the temple of Magna Mater on the Palatine. It has been rightly observed that the 'show of *hetaerae*', in the first act, which represents an original addition of the Roman poet to his Greek original, implies an unusually lavish setting on the part of the authorities responsible for the games. Plautus knew how to use this grace of fortune to create a 'masterpiece of his art'.¹⁹

In Rome, then, existed a very strange state of affairs; the dramatic genres, which in their homeland, though they had originally been at home in cult, had long since been released from that bondage and had developed their proper nature, were now subsequently pushed back into cult-connexions. In this is revealed one of those results which the carrying over of the Hellenistic world to the Roman, with its distinct character and its cult-connexions reminiscent of the archaic age, was bound to produce. The course of action thus adopted has its counterpart in the fact that from this time on the senate decidedly opposed every innovation that overstepped the frame provided for the games by their cult-character. Specially clear is the resistance to the erection of a stone theatre. This resistance corresponded to the old idea that the god attended the games that were given in his honour. Thus the scenic performances of the *ludi Apollinares* were given at the temple of Apollo, the *Megalenses* before the temple of Magna Mater on the Palatine.²⁰ The stage consisted of wooden structures, which, after they had served their purpose, were torn down again. A stone theatre, as permanent site for the scenic games, would have freed them from their former connexion with a definite day of festival, with temple and god, and would have given them (in external form as well) a kind of autonomy. From an interest of the masses in the theatre as such, unfettered in its operation, men feared a degeneration of the people and a decline in the power of defence. These considerations were expressly delivered from the mouth of Scipio Nasica, who was the champion in the debate. Above all, he prevented the building of a theatre, for which the censors of 154 had

actually accepted tenders, from being carried out, and it is a very probable guess that his attitude was determined by the refusal of military service in the year 151.²¹ Here we encounter a contrast between the wishes and inclinations of the masses and the policy of the senate, which was concerned with the preservation of the old, the *mos maiorum*. This attitude, familiar enough in political history, will meet us again later in the history of religion. It will then find closer treatment, and the question will also be considered of the importance, on the other hand, of the advance of the mob of the capital as a new factor of fundamental importance for the development of Roman religion.

We must go back once more to the Secular festival of 249, to exhaust its meaning on the lines just mentioned. In Roman literature the South Italian element plays an important part in the third to second century. Livius Andronicus probably came from Tarentum, Naevius from Campania, and Pacuvius from Brundisium. In architecture,²² in painting and in the small finds of archaeology,²³ the stream of Hellenism proceeding from South Italy cannot well be overlooked. Religion did not stand aloof from this general tendency of the age. With the introduction of the *ludi Tarentini* the signal was given for a whole series of similar innovations, which now found admission to Roman cult.

Beside Pluto and Persephone, the earth-mother, Demeter, was worshipped in Greek South Italy. Of her cult there we can still recognize that the kindly and beneficent traits of her character stood in the foreground. Above all, prominence is given to the destiny of the human soul, its preservation from final death and hopes of a future life.²⁴ With these ideas are connected others, such as the blessedness of the initiates and the punishment of sinners. The character of 'mystery' in the cult of Demeter was thus implied from the first.

We can still follow the process by which such conceptions spread over the peoples of Italy. The Oscans at first took the lead. The Roman choir of twenty-seven maidens has its forerunner on an Oscan grave-painting from Ruvo (circa 400),²⁵ and other similar ideas appear early in the same sphere. Among the deities who were worshipped, together

with Ceres-Demeter, in the Samnite cult of Agnone, we meet an **Euklos* or **Euklos pater*. As has long been realized, he is identical with that *Εὐκλῆς*, the lord of the underworld, who appears on the Orphic inscriptions of the gold leaves of Thurii.²⁵ On a grave-painting from Nola (third century) the dead is enthroned on a richly adorned seat, with the pomegranate in his left hand and a twig in his extended right.²⁷ In both of these attributes we shall not fail to recognize the relation to the queen of the dead and the underworld. Not only the fruit, but the branch of myrtle and olive likewise, belong to their cult; they are offered to Persephone, as queen of Hades, as a gift.²⁸ So, too, the white robe of the dead woman, as she is shown, and the cap with its white band (like the *galerus* of the *flamines*) reminds us of the dress in which the Roman matrons appear at the mysteries of Ceres.²⁹

In Latium the first signs of this circle of ideas begin to push in at about the beginning of the third century. To this time belongs the recently discovered *stips votiva* of a temple in the Valle Ariccia; Demeter and her daughter are represented on the votive gifts. With full right has the publisher recalled cults of South Italy and Sicily.³⁰ In Rome itself³¹ there appears shortly before the Hannibalic War a *sacrum anniversarium Cereris* in August. It was a secret festival, held by the women, which reached its climax in the *Orci nuptiae*. The women appeared, as we have indicated, in a special costume. No wine might be offered; the enjoyment of bread and sexual intercourse was forbidden for the duration of the festival. Other ceremonies that belong to the same age are the ancient *ieiunium Cereris* that was repeated every five years and the *lectisternium* that was offered to the goddess on the 13th of December, the foundation-day of the temple of Tellus on the Carinae. Whether the origin of the sacrifice to Ceres and Hercules on the 21st of the same month goes back to the same epoch is not certain. On Italian soil it finds its parallel in the already mentioned cult of Agnone in Samnium.³²

The first, at least, of the festivals mentioned had the character of a secret celebration. There was nothing fundamentally new in this, for the cult of Bona Dea, ever since the

reception of Damia, had been essentially nothing different. But it does imply an important difference, that now the future after death seems to take the foreground. The mention of the *Orci nuptiae*, that is to say, of the rape as well as of the *ἄνοδος* of Persephone, make the idea at least likely; K. Kerényi³³ has recently called our attention to similar conceptions in the belief of southern Italy.

In this connexion we must refer to the Bacchanalia, of the repression of which in the year 186 Livy has left us an exhaustive account (89, 8-19).³⁴ Here again we have to do with a secret celebration; the *mystae* swore on their admission that they would betray nothing about the rites.³⁵ The ceremonies themselves probably called to mind the death of the god, dismembered by the Titans.³⁶ The translation of mortals to the kingdom of the gods seems also to have been represented and believed (*raptos a dis homines dici*: Livy 29, 18, 18).³⁷

³ That Oriental influences also played a part in the Bacchanalia is probable in the highest degree, and will come up for discussion in our next section. But southern Italy was from of old the seat of such ideas, as we have just emphasized. For the fourth to third century, C. Albizzati³⁸ has succeeded in demonstrating the connexion of hopes of an after-life with the cult of Dionysos. For Cumae, the well-known inscription³⁹ (οὐ θέμις ἐντοῦθα κεῖσθαι ἢ μὲν τον βεβαρχεμένον) proves that the *mysta* expected a privileged position after death.⁴⁰ On a second sepulchral inscription, from Cyme of the fifth century, U. v. Wilamowitz⁴¹ has recognized in *ἄνδρς* the description of the male *mysta*; this reminds us of the inscription of the *mystae* from Frascati,⁴² with its distinct grades among the initiates.

Of the origin of the Bacchanalia, Livy records two important details. In the first place he writes: *primo sacrarium id feminarum fuisse, nec quemquam eo virorum admitti solitum; tres in anno statos dies habuisse, quibus interdum Bacchis initiarentur, sacerdotes in vicem matronas creari solitas* (89, 18, 8 f.);⁴³ it was a Campanian priestess who first gave admission to men. The comparison with the pictures of the Villa Itern at Pompeii has already forced itself on the attention of scholars, those pictures which have for their

subject the initiation of young women into the cult of Dionysos. Into the interpretation in detail, which has aroused lively discussion,⁴⁶ we can the less enter here, as it may now count as proved that the 'Hall of the Mysteries' was certainly no place of cult.⁴⁵ A second piece of information in Livy tells us that the *Bacchanalia* were brought from South Italy to Etruria by a *Graecus ignobilis* and only from there to Rome. Evidence in favour of this can be adduced from the monuments. On a contemporary sarcophagus from Tarquinii the dead woman appears as a Bacchante, with the thyrsus in her hand and a hind at her side.⁴⁸ On a second piece of the same age from Tuscania the dead man himself is represented as Dionysos, with effeminate body, with long hair shadowing the face, and a garland round the neck; in the field of the sarcophagus appear Dionysiac motifs, bunches of grapes and doves.⁴⁷ The neighbouring country once again is the transmitter of a Greek cult.

The severe measures taken by the senate are familiar; the formulation of its decree is preserved (CIL I² 581), with the note of place, *in agro Teurano* (Bruttium). Suppression in Rome was followed by suppression in the rest of Italy as well. The stiffest resistance was encountered in South Italy, from which the movement took its beginning, in Apulia and Tarentum; the persecution there lasted on as late as the year 181 B.C.

2. ROMAN INDIVIDUAL FORM

Wherever in the course of our discussion we have encountered a lively influx of Greek cult and Greek ideas, the process has never been confined to a mere adoption of the foreign element on the part of Rome. A vigorous and successful process of transformation has always set in; it has even seemed that Roman originality nowhere expressed itself so powerfully as in its encounter with the borrowed element, and with the Greek in the first place. We find new confirmation of our view in the fact that in this epoch, which brought with it a new influx of Greek culture, the counterbalancing process was again not wanting, leading, as it must, to a more emphatic expression of Roman individuality.

We shall give two examples to illustrate this point in our next section.

The main body of the influences that we have been discussing came from South Italy, and as one such South Italian cult the cult of Mens used to be regarded.⁴⁸ This goddess received her temple together with Venus of Eryx; it was vowed in the year 217 B.C. and dedicated two years later. The two shrines lay on the Capitol, *canali uno discretæ*. That the cult of Venus represented a mere transference of Aphrodite from the hill of Eryx to Rome cannot be doubted. But that Mens, too, was a Greek cult is not so certain. The nearness of the two shrines may be explained by the nearness in time of their foundations. Even the introduction of Mens by the Sibylline Books does not in this case point decisively to Greek origin. In this very same year, 217, on the counsel of these same oracles, a *votum* was paid to Mars and a 'Sacred Spring' was promised '*si res publica populi Romani Quiritium ad quinquennium proximum steterit*' (Livy 22, 10, 2). Here we have to do with a specifically Italian institution, for which no suspicion of Greek origin can arise. The occurrence of Mens on coins of Paestum and the *magistri Mentis (Bonæ)* there have no importance for our question. The city had been a Latin colony since 273 and even before that had abandoned its native character; that it should have supplied Rome with the model for a Greek cult towards the end of the third century appears hardly credible. The coin-types prove merely a worship of Mens in the colony of Paestum and nothing for the former Greek city. Finally, the interpretation proposed by Wissowa, of Mens as a Greek *σωφροσύνη*, is decidedly discouraged by the fact that in Plutarch the same name is once rendered by *Γνώμη* (*de fort. Rom.* 5), in a second, probably interpolated, by *Εὐβουλία* (*op. cit.* 10).

With this vanishes the last ground for explaining the goddess from Greek religion. The variety in description in Plutarch shows rather that a simple rendering of the Roman word by a Greek was not possible, and, therefore, that we have to do with a native Roman conception. We are confronted, then, with that class of deities, which are usually described as personifications of abstract ideas. In Rome they

are very ancient, as the cult of Victoria or Fides ⁴⁹ shows ; nor is the case otherwise in Greece, where they also occur and play an important part in religion.⁵⁰ Without entering into the nature of these divinities or the differences on the Roman and the Greek side, we need only emphasize that in Rome during the fourth and even more during the third century a whole series of such *numina* either received new temples or was created for the first time. In every case it was important political or military happenings that gave rise to such new foundations. Before them all stands the shrine of Concordia (vowed 367); in it the newly-won unity of the citizens after the struggle of the orders found its symbol. A similar idea is expressed when a temple is vowed to Spes in the First Punic War or in the fight against the Ligurians, to Honos in the battle of Clastidium or at the taking of Syracuse, or to Concordia, once again, on the occasion of a military revolt (216). The force or the human relationship that is expressed in such events, be it hope of good success or harmony or what you will, is conceived as a divine activity, as the expression of a *numen*.

That Mens is to be included in this class is stated by Cicero (*de nat. deorum* 2, 61) and Lactantius (*Inst.* 1, 20, 18) as clearly as one could wish. The fact is also proved both by the name of the goddess and by the date of her introduction. This followed on the disaster at Lake Trasimene, and expresses on the religious side that same decision in favour of a more clear-sighted and considerate attitude that was expressed on the military by the dictatorship and leadership of Q. Fabius Maximus.⁵¹ The circumstance that Mens is often associated with similar personifications points in the same direction. Thus we meet *Mens Bona* together with *Salus* (CIL. 14, 3564), with *Fama* and *Fides* (Persius 2, 8), and once with the complementary idea of *Bona Valetudo* (Petronius, 88; cp., too, Cicero, *de nat. deorum* 3, 88; Ovid, *Amores* 1, 2, 81, &c.).

In general, the measures taken in the course of the Hannibalic War represent an increase of the Greek element in Roman religion. The more need is there to emphasize the fact that in this case, again, on the advice of the Sibylline Books, an independent creation of native Roman character

took place. Over against the foreign rites and ceremonies appears a goddess, in whose activity the Romans at a definite moment recognized one of the effective forces of their political being.

With this we may associate another case, which, though not belonging to the state-cult in the narrower sense, yet shows how vigorously that religious attitude that was characteristic of the Romans could extend to realms that at first sight seem to lie far from religion proper.

One of those questions which are so easy to raise, but which scholarship steadily refuses to answer, is that set by the *Odyssea*^{51a} *latina*, the translation of Homer by Livius Andronicus. Why did he choose the wanderings of Odysseus as his subject and not the Iliad? The Odyssey was his favourite work, thinks F. Leo,⁵² thereby underlining rather than settling the difficulties of an answer. Later, he speaks of the Odyssey 'with its purely human content, as natural to the noble hall in Rome or Greece as to the Roman or German nursery.' This, he thinks, succeeded in producing the appearance of a Latin poem, not of a Greek poem in Latin translation. The last observation is important even if not decisive. But in view of what goes before it, we may fairly ask whether the fight of heroes and the murderous battle would not have had even more charms for the noble hall. And would not a young heart have kindled rather at the splendour that streams from Achilles than at the sufferings of a much-enduring old man? And for a Roman of all men, what could be more suitable than the *magna facta virorum*, such as the Iliad is never weary of recounting?

Here we are faced with a question that compels us to think seriously again. The compulsion is the stronger, as Leo has put his finger on another point of decisive importance. Not only in isolated phrases, such as *diva Monetas filia*, *sancta puer Saturni* and the like, but also in the form of the whole, the poem of Livius seems to have borne the character of a Latin poem precisely where we meet that straining after solemnity of expression⁵³ that is so characteristic of him (and indeed of all Roman epic poetry). The solemnity is attained by a deepened effort to achieve specifically Roman quality, both in form and thought.

But what significance can we attach to this native, un-Greek character of the poem of Livius? We must look about us, and not only in the monuments, but also in the country-side, round the hills and grottoes, the cities and shrines of which legend had long since wound its strands of many hues.

Think first of the Tomba dell' Oreo in Tarquinii; pictures from the Nekyia and the blinding of Polyphemus take up a good part of its frescoes.⁵⁴ On the masterpiece of Etruscan sarcophagi, that of Torre San Severo, the two Trojan scenes, the sacrifice of the Trojan boys and of Polyxena, were demanded by the peculiar direction of Etruscan belief; but beside them, even there, we find an episode from the Nekyia and another from the adventure with Circe.⁵⁵ To these we may add mirrors and gems,⁵⁶ and reliefs of funeral urns⁵⁷ in plenty.

Still less ambiguous in meaning is another fact. We are expressly told that it was Hesiod who set the wanderings of Odysseus in Italy and Sicily, in the realm of the Tyrrhenian sea (Strabo 1 p. 23; Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 3, 311). Indeed, no other part of the ancient world is so thickly sown with recollections of the hero. Sicily counted as the Thrinakrie of Homer; thither were transferred not only the cattle of Helios, but also the Lotus-Eaters and the Cyclops, the Laestrygonians, Scylla and Charybdis. The island of Aeolus was sought in Strongyle or in Lipara, the cave of Calypso on the Lacinian promontory or on the Lake of Avernus; there, too, lay the entrance to the underworld. The Laestrygonians were localized in Formiae, Circe in Misenum or on the promontory that bears her name, the Sirens near Terina and Sorrento. Bruttium and Sorrento once again could boast of temples founded by Odysseus; Baiae and Misenum were called after companions of Odysseus; he himself was said to have wandered to Tyrrhenia and to have been slain there. And 'in the corner of the sacred isles' (Hesiod, *Theog.* 1011 f.) his descendants ruled 'over all the Tyrrhenians of high fame'; in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome Tibur traced back its origin to no less an one than Telegonus.⁵⁸

Greece has nothing to put beside this wealth of allusion.

The home of Odysseus and Corcyra, in which the island of the Phaeacians was almost unanimously recognized, lay in the west and facing towards Italy. It must be that Odysseus was from of old alive in the consciousness of the Italians. Evidence is to be seen in the local forms of his name, of how resolutely men appropriated to themselves the Greek world of legend. By the Etruscans he was called *utuste*, by the Romans *Ulixes*, a form which points to Messapian as its starting-point.⁶⁰ The Etruscans even created an Odysseus type of their own, the type of a 'sleepy' Odysseus that is, it seems, of a hero who wanders by night, not that of the clever and observant Greek (Plutarch, *de aud. poet.* 8).⁶⁰

If we realize all these facts, the action of Livius Andronicus appears in a different light. He is not the Romanized Hellene, as we are so fond of making him. The Latin Odyssey is a national epic, but an Italian, not a Roman. An Italian Koine exists in myth as in language and in art.⁶¹ It is this realm that unites the Greeks of Italy with the native peoples into a single whole.

From this a new standard of judgements arises. We shall have to regard as an essential part of what Livius did, that he set about giving poetic form to this myth in Rome, and thereby not merely raising it into consciousness, but also appropriating it to himself. It is a case of a spiritual conquest on the part of Italian character, which may be set beside the political. This is the more appropriate, as the beginnings of Livius coincide approximately in time with the deliberate claim to Italy as an exclusively Roman domain.

Livius Andronicus was followed by Naevius and Ennius. They, too, were no Romans by nationality, but the stress of development, which had begun with their predecessor, was bound to lead them to create an epic that was no longer Italian but Roman—and Roman, not only in the sense that its material was taken from the realm of Rome, but in that it handled no mythical happenings, but actual history. We have already realized on more than one occasion the indissoluble connexion between the Roman conception of divinity and the idea of history; here, in literature, these Roman conceptions take the place of those earlier ones that had been determined by their Greek model.

3. THE DREAM OF ENNIUS ⁶¹

A very remarkable document of the religious spirit of this age is supplied by the prelude that Ennius set at the beginning of his *Annals*. Often as it has been treated, it has never yet been worthily assessed from the religious point of view nor placed⁶² with the necessary decision in its historical context.

After many efforts, agreement about the content of the piece has in all essentials been reached, chiefly through the decisive studies of Vahlen. It was the story of a dream that befell the poet himself; as we are expressly told, it took place on Parnassus. On that mount there appeared to Ennius the form of Homer and, shedding 'salt tears', greeted the Roman as a new incarnation of himself. In the mouth of the shade of Homer was placed a speech, in which he expressed himself about the nature of the world, about life and death, body and soul. The doctrine that he taught was nothing less than the transmigration of souls. The soul of Homer had passed after his death into a peacock, before it found a new resting-place in the Roman poet. To him and his work was promised eternal fame, as was only natural for the new incarnation of Homer.

What Ennius intended with this idea requires no elaborate explanation. The dream was the symbol and confirmation of his own quality as poet. Scholars have not hesitated, therefore, to place the scene in a wider setting in the history of literature. Here, the initiation of Hesiod by the Muses, as recounted by him at the beginning of the *Theogony*, formed the starting-point, the prelude to the *Ätina* of Callimachus the immediate predecessor.⁶³ This latter poet was translated in a dream from Alexandria to Helicon, the mount where Hesiod had had his encounter with the Muses. The call of Hesiod was retold, with new characteristics. Hesiod now received his initiation, not by the staff, which had once made its recipient a rhapsode, but by a draught of Hippocrene, which thus became for all time the spring of poets. Next followed Callimachus's own calling, which was modelled in all details on that of the elder poet; this corresponded to the attitude of Callimachus, who had raised Hesiod to royal

rank.¹⁴ We may omit here any detailed account of the successors of which this story could boast in the Augustan age.⁶⁵ Let us look only at the poem of Propertius, 3, 3. There the poet dreams that he has drunk of Hippocrene, as Ennius once had done, and that he is thereby called to heroic epic. But Apollo points him to another spring lower down the hill. One of the Muses sprinkles him with its water, of which Philotas had once drunk, and thus initiates him as poet of love.

There is, then, a sure line of connexion running from Hesiod through Callimachus down to the Augustan poets. To introduce Ennius into this sequence was the more tempting, as he, too, told of a dream. The words of Propertius, that Ennius had drunk of the fount of Helicon (3, 3, 6), and the praise in Lucretius of the man—

*qui primus amoeno
detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam*

(1, 117 f.), seemed to confirm this view. Vahlen⁶⁶ could even consider whether the vision of Homer did not take place not on Parnassus, but, like the others, on Helicon.

To have finally disposed of this combination is the merit of E. Reitzenstein; ⁶⁷ Leo ⁶⁸ had preceded him with some qualifying remarks. The localization of the dream on Parnassus is surely beyond doubt,⁶⁹ and, whatever we are to make of the passage of Lucretius just quoted and its connexion of Hippocrene with Ennius,⁷⁰ the drink of the spring of poets has no place inside the prelude to the *Annals*. The absurdities of the older view have been effectively brought out by E. Reitzenstein, and if something has still to be added here, it is only because he does not seem to have gone far enough with his separation. Even if he no longer believes, as Leo still did, that the dependence of Ennius on Callimachus is absolutely guaranteed by the motif of the dream, he is still not disposed to question at least the possibility.⁷¹ This possibility, too, however, seems to vanish on closer consideration.

We shall have at once to admit that if the Roman poet really took the dream of Callimachus as his model, he has certainly not shrunk from fundamental alterations. That

Homer should take the place of the Muses is the smallest difficulty; both that and the heroic stylization⁷² of the whole might be the result of Ennius's resolve to create a national Roman epic. Of more importance is the fact that no deities appear, but that the shade of the mighty dead rises from Hades to reveal himself to the living. And when we come to his message, the future fame of the poet's work has indeed its place (Horace, *Ep.* 2, 1, 50 f.), but beside it there was something to be read that had not been in Hesiod or in Callimachus. It was the *rerum natura* (Lucretius 1, 126), a doctrine, ready and complete, that is expounded, a special knowledge that is divulged.

With the changed content of the revelation is connected a further important distinction. It can hardly be denied that this is no initiation of a poet in the strict and exact sense. Ennius from the first was made to be a poet, from the moment that the soul of Homer entered into him. There is no question, then, of the conferment of divine power occurring only at the time of the dream, but only of a revelation, of a consciousness of what was already implied by the reincarnation of Homer in the person of Ennius.

The general question must now be raised whether the mere agreement over the dream-motif is enough to guarantee the imitation of the model of Callimachus.⁷³ We should remember that the ancients themselves never thought of connecting the dream of Ennius with that of his supposed model. This is the more striking, as in both cases we have to do with famous creations of ancient literature. For Ennius the unanimous view of all witnesses is to the effect that Pythagorean doctrine is present.⁷⁴ Just as Pythagoras supposed himself to have the knowledge that the soul of the Homeric Euphorbus had found its reincarnation in him, so did Ennius come to the same realization for the rebirth of Homer (Tertullian, *de anima* 34). In doing so he applied the doctrine of the transmigration of souls to his own person.⁷⁵ Familiarity with such views has nothing to surprise us in the case of Ennius of all men. His South Italian origin was bound to bring him early into contact with the Pythagoreans.⁷⁶ We have a number of pieces of evidence to show that their influence was not confined to the Greeks, but

extended to the neighbouring Italian peoples. Lucanians, Messapians and Peucetians are said to have come to Pythagoras, as Aristoxenus reports in Porphyry, *v. Pythag.* 22.⁷⁷ In a dialogue of the Tarentine Nearchus there appeared as spokesmen, beside Plato, the Pythagorean Archytas and the Samnite Pontius, the father of the victor of Caudium (Cicero, *Cato maior* 12, 41).⁷⁸ On one occasion we hear of an Etruscan Pythagorean; the general question of Pythagorean (and with them of Orphic) influences on the religion of the Etruscans has recently evoked a plentiful literature, to which we can only refer here.⁷⁹

We are taken a step farther by the observation that one of the fragments of the prelude of Ennius (10-13) seems to show an extensive agreement with a fragment of Epicharmus (fr. 172 K.).⁸⁰ The master of Sicilian comedy was less remembered by the later world as such than as a teacher of wisdom.⁸¹ He, too, is said to have been a Pythagorean (Diogenes Laertius 8, 78; Iamblichus, *v. Pythag.* 226; cp. 241). Ennius himself had translated a didactic poem that passed under the name of Epicharmus. At the beginning of this stood an account of its setting: Ennius dreamed that he was dead and in Hades. There he received from Epicharmus himself the doctrine *περὶ φύσεως*.⁸² It is a situation entirely agreeing with the introduction to the *Annals*. Here, as there, the setting is given by a dream-experience; on each occasion it is the great dead who reveals to Ennius the nature of the world.

That the special form was Ennius's own creation need hardly be emphasized. The suggestion was already present, for the original work, as its recently discovered beginning shows (Hibeh Pap. 1 f.), like the genuine *Theognis* or the *Erga* of Hesiod, was directed to an interlocutor. But this was no individual reader, but remained, in accordance with the more general character of the collection, undefined as a person.⁸³ On the other hand, the place where Ennius met his Epicharmus had its immediate forerunner in the Pythagorean and Orphic literature.⁸⁴ There was a journey of Orpheus to Hades, so too one of Pythagoras; in them and a number of similar books there was told the story of translation to the underworld. There were to be seen the punish-

ments of sinners and the rewards of the blessed; there, too, was proclaimed the doctrine of the transmigration of souls.⁸⁵

With this, some contact with the prelude to the *Annals* is at once implied. As a matter of fact, not only Epicharmus, but also our prelude, has already been set in the context just defined.⁸⁶ We must admit that here, if anywhere, is the sphere in literature in which this piece of Ennius's poetry must be placed.⁸⁷ And yet, if Homer appears on Parnassus and not in Hades itself, this implies, if we take it seriously, a marked divergence. But more than this, the prelude as a whole represents a creation of far too original, far too personal a stamp for it to be covered, let alone exhausted, by being assigned to a literary genre.

Above all, we must maintain that it was something much more than a mere playing with a traditional form. What Ennius here offered meant the consciousness of his own greatness and his position in the rising poetry of Rome. The knowledge of his distinction above other men, the sense of his own calling, clothed itself in the form of the dream of Homer. What Ennius here announced was not merely of supreme importance for himself, but it was meant to appear so to others too. It is this supreme importance that is expressed in the rôle that is assigned to Homer.

Ennius boasted of descent from the mythical ancestor of his native people of Apulia, from Messapus (*Ann.* fr. 376 V.). But beside this physical forbear Homer must henceforth appear as spiritual ancestor. This was an unavoidable result, if Ennius took seriously what he relates in his prelude of the previous life of his own soul. We have only to realize this, and two facts at once become obvious; in the first place, not only was Homer the great universally valid model for heroic epic, but for Ennius personally he meant much more than that. The poet, too, was his ancestor, though indeed in another and a higher sense than was Messapus. From this follows the second result; through this quality as ancestor the speech of Homer takes its place in a new sphere and one that is specifically Roman. What we mean is the instruction and revelation communicated by dead forebears. We need only mention here two famous examples.

We begin with the *Somnium Scipionis*; Cicero himself placed it beside the dream of Ennius (*de rep.* 6, 10, 10).⁸⁸ A number of agreements offer themselves at once for comparison. First Africanus, then Aemilius Paullus, appears to the young Scipio in a dream, and the revelation that is made is, as with Ennius, the fate of the soul. The story goes on to tell of the high reward that falls to his lot who has deserved well of his fatherland, of the heavenly seats where dwell those who on earth have practised piety and righteousness.⁸⁹ Beside this stands, again as in Ennius, the revelation of the future; speedy and supreme fame,⁹⁰ but thereafter death by the hand of his kin at the height of his career.

Even more remarkable is a further point: Homer, in contrast to the ancestor by nature and by blood, was designated as the spiritual ancestor of Ennius. In Cicero there stands beside Scipio's actual father, Aemilius Paullus, yet another ancestor, the Elder Scipio. But, whereas with the former we find nothing but intimate personal closeness and passionate sympathy,⁹¹ the relation between Africanus and his grandson is certainly not expressed in terms of human blood-relationship. Africanus is there as model simply, linked to the younger 'less by virtue of close relationship, than of political succession.'⁹² He too, it is true, is an ancestor, but he has grown beyond that into a more general exemplary character.⁹³ Here again, then, physical and spiritual ancestry fall apart, and as in Ennius spiritual ancestry is incorporated in Homer as the model of heroic epic, so in the story of Cicero does it find expression in the figure of one of the greatest leaders in Roman history. The correspondence with the rôle of Homer is complete, inasmuch as it is in the mouth of Africanus and of him only that the prophecies in Cicero are placed. He it is who speaks throughout, interrupted only by a short speech of Paullus.⁹⁴

After the Dream of Scipio we find our second comparison in the speech of Anchises at the pageant of heroes in the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid*. Just as in it the contacts with the doctrine of the Orphics and Pythagoreans multiply,⁹⁵ so too is an agreement with the Pythagorean vision of Ennius not wanting.⁹⁶ Once again forebear and descendant stand face to face, only that in this case no distinction is made

between physical descent and spiritual and model ancestry; Anchises is to Aeneas both at once. The place is the underworld; Virgil has gone back to the oldest form. What is revealed is the doctrine of the transmigration of souls (724-51), the same message that Homer gave to the Roman poet. To this is linked once again the vision of the future, the fate that is allotted to the descendants of Aeneas and the Trojans, the vision of the men who are to lead Rome to greatness (756-886).

The part taken for the Greeks by the figures of myth was largely taken for the Romans by their ancestors, the *maiores*; what they had once created, what they had once approved, gives validity to the actions of the living.⁹⁷ The speech of Anchises himself certainly goes back to Pythagorean doctrine,⁹⁸ but that it should be put into the mouth of Anchises and not of a Pythagoras or an Epicharmus represents an important innovation. Here, as in the setting of the *Somnium Scipionis*, be the other sources what they may, there lies the specifically Roman conception of the decisive and normative importance of ancestors. It is from this same point of view that the prelude of Ennius is to be understood. When the Roman poet succeeds, through the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, in recognizing in himself the resurrection of Homer, Homer becomes the spiritual ancestor of the Roman. With this, the figure and rôle of Homer (whether his speech concerns the revelation of the nature of the world or the prophecy of the poetic fame of Ennius) receives, in a way peculiarly Roman, an enhanced worth that renders it authoritative and obligatory. Here for the first time literary expression was given to that which gained its classical stamp in the treatment of Cicero and Virgil.

This implies that the creation of Ennius is not, as was once thought, a mere imitation, a remodelling of a borrowing from Greece, but rather the beginning of a series of developments of its own. And, equally important, it represents the expression in literature of a peculiarly Roman idea. Its originality is so far limited, that the poet only gave form to that which was supplied to him ready-made in Roman ideas and conceptions. But to have been the first to realize that

in them lay something capable of literary form and of value—that fame is his and can hardly be taken from him.

We may put it in this way: Ennius presents himself, it is true, as a Pythagorean, as was only natural in view of his origin and training. But the former native of Rudiae became a Roman, and the borrowings from Pythagoreanism were comprehended in a Roman spirit and remoulded into a new whole; they received an original, a Roman form. This agrees well with the idea that we should on general grounds be disposed to form of the genius of Ennius. What seems to be much less obvious is this—how could the poet venture to present to his Roman contemporaries without any preliminaries a doctrine of Pythagoras? With this we plunge into one of the most fateful episodes in the history of religion and spiritual life in Rome and Italy.

Let us take one special point first. The soul of Homer passes into a peacock before it experiences rebirth in Ennius. What does this mean?—In the symbolism of the Empire (both pagan and Christian), even in that of the Hellenistic age, the peacock denotes eternity.⁹⁹ If we could assume the same for Ennius, this transformation would be a symbol of his poetic immortality, of his eternal worth. Lucretius (1, 124) actually speaks of the appearance of the *semper florens Homerus*. That the peacock was already understood in this sense in the time of Ennius and in his immediate environment has been recognized by the acumen of Furtwängler.¹⁰⁰ In treating of Italian gems he has pointed out representations of the peacock with this meaning and has connected them with others in which he thought he could detect similar ideas of the Orphics and Pythagoreans. He, too, has drawn the lines of connexion both with Christian symbolism and with the dream of Ennius.

The narrative of Ennius, then, finds its counterpart in contemporary art. But it may also be set in an even wider context; here again Furtwängler saw the decisive point.¹⁰¹ The doctrine of Pythagoras must have had a wide importance for Rome as early as the Samnite and Punic Wars. Only a few examples can be quoted here.

Under the stress of the Samnite Wars Rome turned to Delphi. The answer was given that a statue should be

set up both to the bravest and to the wisest of the Greeks. In this way Alcibiades and Pythagoras came to receive monuments in the forum (Pliny, *n. h.* 84, 26; Plutarch, *Numa* 8); it was in him, then, and not in Plato or Socrates, that the height of Greek wisdom was expressed for the Romans. There was a widespread belief that King Numa had been a pupil of Pythagoras; Pythagoras was even said to have received Roman citizenship (Epicharmus in Plutarch, *op. cit.* 8). The family of the Aemilii traced its descent from an offspring of Numa, whom he named after the son of his teacher, Pythagoras.¹⁰² Cicero speaks at greater length of the reputation of Pythagoras in Rome (*Tuscul.* 4, 2-5); he gives the name of 'Pythagorean' to the collection of oracles made by Appius Claudius Caecus. Into the age of Ennius himself we are finally led by the story of the grave that was discovered in the year 181. It was taken to be the grave of the Pythagorean, Numa, and its writings were taken as Pythagorean; the senate, in a fit of caution, had them burnt.

In the time of Cicero, then, Pythagoreanism in Rome stood in the highest repute; Nigidius Figulus is the representative personality. The relation of this Indian summer of the sect to the Pythagoreans, who were dying out in the fourth century, has always been a problem. But that there was never a breach of continuity in Rome has already been emphasized.¹⁰³ On the Greek side the gap seems to be gradually lessening. The author of 'Ocellus' and the work of 'Philolaus' on the world-soul belong to the second century.¹⁰⁴ Only a little earlier is the Pythagoreanism of Ennius, which he must have brought with him from his home.

The last section has introduced us to a series of important influences from Greek South Italy. Their importance has once again been proved in connexion with the story of the dream of Ennius. But not only as regards origin, as regards character, too, they may be compared with what has already been observed. Once again is revealed the concern with that realm that holds the centre of attention in the mysteries, the continued existence of the soul and its destiny after death.

4. THE EAST

The picture that we have drawn of Rome in Hellenistic times would be incomplete without a mention of the Oriental cults. The important part that they played in the last two centuries of the Republic can to-day be sketched with more definiteness than before, even if in some points judgement must still be suspended. Beside the agreement with Hellenism in general, we cannot fail to see once again a special Roman development.

Both in point of time and of importance the Roman cult of the Great Mother must be named in the first place. Its adoption represents the extension of the political reputation of the state; it was the immediate result of the first engagement of Rome in the affairs of the East.¹⁰⁵ Towards the end of the Second Punic War (204), at the instance of the Sibylline Books, the sacred meteorite of the goddess, which had fallen to earth at Pessinus, was brought to Rome; there it received a place, at first in the temple of Victory on the Palatine, later in a temple on the same Hill specially built for it.¹⁰⁶

The general view to-day is, that in the train of the Great Mother a number of other extravagant cults and Oriental superstitions in mass made their way to Rome.¹⁰⁷ All of these will have tried, with excellent reason we may suppose, to withdraw themselves from the oversight of the senate. The senate had taken over no light task in its inspection of cults; its temporary success may therefore appear as no more than the beginning of the process of decay. This view fits into the general picture that is usually drawn of the history of this epoch, but in certain points it nevertheless requires correction.

For the *Mater Deum Magna Idaea* it is at once significant that from the outset a state-cult was devoted to her; recollections of the legendary origin of the Romans from Troy and Asia Minor will have from the first played a decisive part.¹⁰⁸ With this official character of the cult, hallowed as it was by the great past, were connected a number of restrictions to which the original Oriental ritual was subjected. The performances, at which the eunuch-priests (*galli*) might show themselves in public, were extremely

limited. To Roman citizens it was forbidden to belong to this college.¹⁰⁹ Finally, the worship of the deity, who in the Empire stands in the middle of the sacred ceremonies, Attis, as yet formed no part of the cult. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (2, 19, 5) cannot get over his surprise that those orgiastic rites, that celebrate the death and resurrection of the god, were at that time so completely missing in Rome. But even more significant than these restrictions, in which the Roman sense of the dignity of divine worship found expression, is another factor—the connexion with the ruling class of the state.

The cult of Ceres, Liber and Libera was in a special degree proper to the plebs; even so was the worship of the Great Mother an affair of the nobility. The image of the goddess found reception at the hands of that man, *qui est optimus populi Romani iudicatus*, P. Scipio, *femina autem quae matronarum castissima putabatur*, Q. Claudia (Cicero, *de harusp. resp.* 18, 27). Both of them belonged to the first families of the state, and, in the same way, only the *matronae primores civitatis* (Livy 29, 14, 12) had the right to bear the sacred stone on its arrival in their hands. So again we are told of the nobility that they celebrated the festival year by year with mutual entertainment and feasting, and that from their circle were formed *sodalitates* to worship the Great Mother.¹¹⁰ So, too, it was the curule aediles who were entrusted with the celebration of the sacred games, the *ludi Megalenses*.¹¹¹

The Roman cult of Magna Mater, then, presents itself as a creation of decided peculiarity of form; Oriental belief and Roman sense of form have blended in one whole. Of quite a different character is the worship of those Oriental deities who followed that cult to Rome. A comparison with them exhibits the peculiarity of which we have spoken in a new light.

It is indeed the case that, just as the reception of the Great Mother implied as its cause the beginning of Rome's entanglements in the affairs of the East, and of Asia Minor in particular, so too did the other cults give prominence to the new position of Rome as the capital in the making of the world of that age. In this context we must once again

refer to the Bacchanalia. In Italy itself they had started in Campania and Magna Graecia, but their real origin is to be sought in the East. Since the researches of F. Cumont¹¹² and R. Reitzenstein,¹¹³ it is no longer doubtful that behind them lies an Oriental cult of Dionysos. It is no chance, then, that, shortly before the senate saw itself obliged to step in against the Bacchanalia, a similar movement appears in Egypt. We had already known before how large a part was played by the Dionysiac element at the court of Ptolemaeus Philopator, not least with the king himself.¹¹⁴ We can now add an edict which orders a supervision of the Mysteries of Dionysos, especially ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ.¹¹⁵ It may perhaps be possible to demonstrate a direct connexion in this case with Rome.¹¹⁶

Other connexions between Italy and the Empire of the Ptolemies may be observed. The chief cult that was created by the kings, that of Serapis, had not as yet found admittance to Rome, but on Delos the Roman merchants belong to the most earnest worshippers of the god.¹¹⁷ Similar is the case with the Egyptian Isis, who was everywhere received where the power and connexions of the Ptolemies reached. In Catana and Syracuse she had been adopted as early as the time of Ptolemy Soter and Agathocles. In Italy, Puteoli formed the gate of entry for Isis (and Serapis). The shrine of Isis in Pompeii dates from the turn of the second and first centuries; in Rome the college of the *pastophori* is attested as early as the age of Sulla.

Beside Egypt stand Asia Minor and Syria as centres of distribution for religious ideas. The wars with Antiochus had led to close contact with this world. In an age in which in the land of the Nile an astrological literature, written in Greek, begins to take form, there spread in Rome the *Chaldaei*, the soothsayers, who made their appeal to the star-lore of the Chaldaeans.¹¹⁸ Together with them the *praetor peregrinus* of the year 189 B.C., Cn. Cornelius Hispanus, expelled the Jews, who devoted themselves to the cult of Jupiter Sabazius, from the city and destroyed their altars, which they had erected in public places. They were Hellenized Jews, who thought that in the Phrygian and Thracian Sabazius they had found again their own Sabaoth.¹¹⁹ The

chief goddess of Syria, Atargatis, who was also called simply the *Συρία θεά* (*dea Syria*), reached Rome mainly through the slaves who came from that country. It was only after the birth of Christ that she had her own temple there on the Janiculum. But as early as the revolt of the slaves in Sicily in the year 134 B.C. the leader was a servant of the Syrian goddess. In similar fashion will have been introduced the cult of Mithras, with which the Romans first came in contact in the war with the pirates. Finally, the Cappadocian Ma owes her introduction to the campaigns in Asia Minor. Her warlike cult, which had become connected with that of the Persian Anahita, was first encountered by Sulla and his soldiers in the interior of Asia Minor in the year 92. To Sulla himself the mistress of battles and victories afterwards appeared in a dream, before his march on Rome.

Rich indeed in results is the comparison of all these cults with that of the Magna Mater. The case that we have just mentioned is peculiar in this, that a member of the nobility appears among the worshippers of an Oriental goddess. But the religious susceptibilities of Sulla must not be so readily brought into the question, for the great individual creates his own forms, even in the presence of the gods. The charges of superstition that were brought against him were not confined to those of Eastern origin. And, furthermore, we should have to ask whether what really matters here can be understood under the ordinary categories. Granted that it was no ordinary things that he reported in his Memoirs about his personal intercourse with the gods, it still seems to me far more fruitful, instead of talking of superstition, to consider whether they are not the expression of the special position of the great individual in face of the divine order of the world;¹²⁰ I mean, of that coincidence of deed and destiny, of Daimon and Tyche, which makes their bearer appear in his innermost and most personal activity, both to himself and to others, as the instrument of a higher necessity. It was thus that in modern times a Napoleon understood himself.

Neglecting this special case, we may see almost everywhere that it was the lower population, the strangers resident in Rome and the slaves, who brought with them the flood of Oriental ideas or gave ready welcome to them.

At this point we may quote a very remarkable passage in Livy (25, 1, 6 f.). With the long duration of the Hannibalic War *tanta religio et ea magna ex parte externa civitatem incessit, ut aut homines aut dei repente alii viderentur facti*. In full publicity they went their way; men ceased to sacrifice to the gods and to address their prayers to them after the manner of their fathers. Street-corner priests and seers urged on the movement; their clients were the women. *Quorum numerum auxit rustica plebs ex incultis diutino bello infestisque agris egestate et metu in urbem compulsa*. For the first time a mob of the capital appears as the bearer of a religious movement; it had grown up when residence on its landed possessions had been rendered impossible by the war. What was for the time a mere passing phase became in the course of the second century the rule. The growth of the Latifundia and the decline of peasant small-holdings created a city mob, without possessions, that ever increased by additions from all parts of the extending Empire. Without this fundamental shifting of social grades, to which we can merely refer here, the success of the Oriental religions is unintelligible. In them there was ready at hand a mass capable of receiving them, which willingly abandoned itself to the magic of that strange world. Slowly it succeeded in imposing its tastes on the leading classes. It is simply undeniable that a revolution from below, a penetration of the old spirit of religion by the instincts and ideas of the lower strata, is to be seen here.

That the *externa religio*, with its *sacrificuli ac vates*, that meets us in the year 218, was an Oriental one, can be guessed,¹²¹ but not proved. With the Bacchanalia, however, the case is clear. It is important, therefore, that again it is the lower classes and non-Romans who appear as its adherents. A *Graecus ignobilis* had first brought them to Etruria, *nulla cum arte earum, quas multas ad animorum corporumque cultum nobis eruditissima omnium gens invecit, sacrificulus et vates, nec is, qui aperta religione, propalam et quaestum et disciplinam profitendo, animos errore imbueret, sed occultorum et nocturnorum antistes sacrorum* (Livy 39, 8, 3). A freedwoman, Hispala Fecenia, belongs to the mysteries; Campanians had made the decisive changes in

the ritual (13, 9); the leaders of the movement were M. and C. Atinius *de plebe Romana*, further a Faliscan and a Campanian (17, 6). A multitude, numbering many thousands, was initiated into the rites. Again the women play a leading part and with them the dregs of the population: *simillimi feminis mares, stuprati et constupratores, fanatici, vigiliis vino strepitibus clamoribusque nocturnis adtoniti* (15, 9).

Against these we can set those traits that we have been observing. The foreign slaves bring their gods with them, as do also the settlers from the Eastern peoples; Chaldaeans and Syrian *negotiatores* complete the picture. Marius, who had risen from a humble station, gave ear to the admonitions of a Syrian prophetess (Plutarch, *Marius* 17). When in the year, 103, the high-priest of the Great Mother of Pessinus came to Rome, he found a great following among the people; the senate found itself obliged to receive him and give a hearing to his complaints.¹²²

It will be seen how unmistakable is the contrast between all these cults and Magna Mater, who had been adopted among the gods of the state and who was worshipped by the nobility. There is yet another point in which a similar contrast appears. In the cult of Magna Mater the element of orgiastic and ecstasy was restricted to the narrowest limits; as late as the time of Augustus a Greek could not get over his surprise at the dignity of this Oriental cult (Dion. Hal. 2, 19, 4 f.), and Cicero (*de har. resp.* 12, 24) describes the *ludi Megalenses* as *maxime casti, solemnes, religiosi*. Quite other is the case of the cults that we have been describing; the orgiastic element actually takes a central position there.

Again it is the Bacchanalia that supply us with the most important features. The initiates assembled at night-time at the grove of Semele (*in luco Similae*: Livy 39, 12, 4) or Stimula (Ovid, *Fasti* 6, 508), at the foot of the Aventine, not far from the Tiber. Here rang out their nocturnal cries (Livy 39, 15, 6) which echoed through the whole city. It was reported to the consul, *viros velut mente capta* (cp. 15, 8) *cum iactatione fanatica corporis vaticinari*; *matronas Baccharum habitu crinibus sparsis cum ardentibus facibus decurrere ad Tiberim* (18, 12). We find similar features

on other occasions: the leader of the slave-revolt of 184 B.C., whom we have already mentioned, a servant of the Syrian goddess, called his companions to arms by acting an inspired madness and a command received from heaven (Florus 2, 7 [8, 19]; Diodorus 34, 2, 5 f.). To Sulla, returning home from Asia, a Cappadocian slave, a worshipper of the local goddess, prophesied his victory over Marius (Plutarch, *Sulla* 27).

Even the worship of Magna Mater in course of time comes to exhibit similar traits, despite all measures taken to prevent it.¹²³ In the year 102 a slave of Servilius Caepio castrated himself in honour of the goddess; it was thought sufficient to ship him overseas. Here already a merciful procedure is manifest, and when in the year 77 a member of a plebeian family and a Roman citizen appears among the *galli*, he is left unmolested; only the power to dispose of his property by will is taken from him. Most remarkable is another feature. We know from the papyrus documents of the Serapeum of Memphis of the *κάτοχοι* of that place, over whose significance a lively discussion has developed in the last few years. They are tied to the shrine and are in subjection to the god. He himself speaks to them in dream; he can even in this way release the *κάτοχος* from his sacred bondage. In Rome, too, prophecies of such *κάτοχοι* . . . ἐκ τῆς τῶν θεῶν Μητρὸς γινόμενοι are at least once mentioned (Dio Cassius 48, 48 on the year 38). We might be disposed in that case to suppose a confusion with the fanatics of Ma, who herself functioned as *pedisequa* of the Great Mother.¹²⁴ Among their ceremonies were the ecstatic dances, during which they made their own blood flow under the blows of swords and axes; at the same time they announced the future to the spectators. R. Reitzenstein¹²⁵ has already drawn them into this context, without, however, quoting the passage just cited. But an identification of the prophetic *κάτοχοι* of the Great Mother with these *fanatici* is, despite their close relationship, not necessary. In later times we meet on an inscription a *vates Frugeae matris* (CIL, 6, 18528),¹²⁶ and thus the phenomenon is attested for the cult of the Great Mother herself.

In view of all these facts, it is easy enough to understand

how the nobility, that is to say, the senate, offered itself as champion of the *mos patrius* against the foreign cults. The innovations as such, implying the undermining of the ancient religion and the conceptions connected with it, and their political consequences alike seemed to call for the intervention of the authorities.

As early as the happenings of the year 218 the action of the senate was directed towards abolishing the innovations as completely as possible. It was decided that, *quicumque libros vaticinios precesiones aut artem sacrificandi conscriptam haberet*, should deliver them up (Livy 25, 1, 12; cp. 89, 16, 8). The blow was thus aimed at the sacred writings. Again, on the occasion of the discovery of the grave of Numa, the senate caused the rolls that were found in it to be burnt, and a similar procedure was adopted in Ptolemaic Egypt against the mysteries of Dionysos; there the words of the liturgy had to be communicated to a confidential agent of the Government. Again, in the case of the Bacchanalia there is mention of a sacred text which was recited by the priest to the candidate for initiation (Livy 89, 18, 8),¹²⁷ and on pictorial representations the *ἱερός λόγος* and its recitation appear again and again.¹²⁸

The Roman view only admitted anything that looked like mysteries when it was celebrated within the frame of the state religion and under corresponding control. To such authorized mysteries belong the festival of the Bona Dea¹²⁹ or the mysteries of Ceres, to which we have already referred. Quite different was the case of such private institutions as the Bacchanalia. R. Reitzenstein¹³⁰ has shown us how in them the secret celebration as such and the oath,¹³¹ which the *mystae* had to take, were regarded by the senate as 'conspiracy'. This created an important precedent. Further motives that influenced the action of the senate are set out in the speech of the consul in reference to the case of the Bacchanalia (Livy 89, 15-16). We would stress his emphatic declaration that the practice of religion as established by the forefathers was the only one authorized, that the innovations, on the other hand, were bound to lead to corruption and licence. An important part is also played by the concern for the maintenance of man-power, as we have

already emphasized in discussing the attitude of Nasicæ to the building of a theatre. The same motives recur in the later course of events. When the Jewish worshippers of Jupiter Sabazius were banished from the city and from all Italy, the action was taken because they *Romanos inficere mores* or *Romanis tradere sacra sua conati sunt* (Excerpts of Julius Paris and Nepotianus in Valerius Maximus 1, 3, 3). Cicero himself in his ideal legislation, in forbidding mysteries (*de leg.* 2, 21 ; 34 f.) appeals to the *senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus* and emphasizes their threat to morals as a decisive factor.¹³²

In these views is expressed something more than the immediate political purpose of combating the Oriental and orientalizing cults—and that is a lively consciousness of the special nature of Roman religion. It is understood as a clearly defined system, sanctified by the tradition and will of the ancestors, in which resides a value that demands unqualified acceptance. But at the same time is revealed the decision to change one's attitude to all that was new. After that religion had readily opened itself for centuries to foreign influences, with only one interruption of relatively short extent, now for the first time sets in a deliberate defence against the outside world, an insistence on the traditional. It cannot be mistaken that this change of attitude took place at a period when the native forces of religion, at the first glance, at least, seemed to be in process of disappearing.

Yet this attitude was of supreme importance for the future. The age of Augustus linked up with it. But that age did not stop at the negative position, it conceived the appeal to the *mos maiorum* in an incomparably deeper and more pregnant sense. That was why it succeeded in filling the inherited forms with a new and living content.

Book IV

THE AUGUSTAN AGE

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

AS early as the age of the kings, and at the beginning of the Republic, Rome had already adopted the divine world of the Greeks, its legends and the outward forms of its cult. But, strong as the influx then may have been, immediate contact with Greece only took place in that earliest age sporadically and towards its close. Moreover, other peoples of Italy, the Etruscans before all the rest, played the part of intermediaries; in this is simply expressed one side of that supremacy which they then held over Latium and early Rome.

It was only with the conquest of Italy that a lasting connexion with Greece proper was achieved. From the beginning of the third century new Greek cults find their way to Rome, at first one at a time, but soon in larger measure. By the side of the innovations in religion goes the first development of a Roman literature in that age. Though in its beginnings occasionally linked to cult, it soon rises to independence.

In this second period there is present from the first a difference of principle from earlier times. Not only is the former cultural primacy of Etruria ousted more and more by Hellenism, but Hellenism itself is never received through the mediation of other Italian peoples. Rome herself undertakes to be the bringer of the new stream to the rest of Italy.¹ For Roman culture itself an immediate relationship to Greece is without exception aimed at. From now on no other possibility can be conceived except to seek it at its source, to win it for oneself by independent study, above all by knowledge of the language and literature. This demand, once made, remained in force for all time to come.

It is of the highest importance that with these two stages of the adoption of the Greek element another development runs parallel.

In the view of the older generation of scholars the existence of a national Roman religion, worthy of the name in the strict and most exact sense, stood at the beginning of the historical development. It belonged (so it was supposed) to an age when Rome had not yet laid herself open with her later readiness to foreign influences, but formed a community quite apart. Having no connexion with the general course of history, she gave herself up to her own individuality.

In this picture of the earliest Rome we see the unconscious after-effects of a view that received currency first from Niebuhr, but still now and then peeps out of the great narrative of Mommsen. For Niebuhr, the prime of Roman history was the epoch of the old, morally sound peasant-state. With the influx of Greek culture and the contemporaneous beginning of a policy of force in the Punic Wars a pure and untroubled world finds its close. If the undermining of the traditional temper of old Rome and the lawless subjugation of other peoples thus coincided, the ancient times, on the other hand, shone in glory unsurpassed; here, if anywhere, must the nature of Rome show itself in its uncorrupted form.

Our own account represents a fundamentally different conception. The development of specifically Roman forms and conceptions is everywhere a process which only occurs gradually and which is determined in its intensity and scope by that other process, that aims at the acquisition of Greek culture. A deeper comprehension of this model has always as its result a deeper and more intimate realization of the national values peculiar to Rome. The same is true in the sphere of religion; those values do not represent a gift of fate or the result of a natural development, but their appearance is always the consequence of an enhancement of the national consciousness won from the Greek model, and of a will intent on its ends. With this goes the clear recognition that the unfolding of a special Roman form is a phenomenon that appears not at the beginning of the history of Roman religion, but in the course of its growth.

In the earliest age there was no possible question of regarding the Greek element as a specific quality or as an organism, clearly defined and internally coherent in its plan and its history, nor do the national Roman traits find expression except in relatively slight degree. Rome at this time represents rather a part of Italy, whose culture in essential points was already a unified one. Peculiarities existed, but our earlier narrative has shown that the earliest gods of Rome were, over large ranges, those of the rest of Italy. This is just as true of those of Greek as of those of native origin.

It is only with the end of this epoch that, as we have said, an immediate contact with Greece appears. As a result, an important manifestation of Roman individuality was to be observed at the same moment. At the introduction of Ceres, Liber and Libera, in which that contact was for the first time realized, we also met (in the consultation of the Sibylline Books on occasion of a famine) that contrast of divine warning and human 'attention' to it which is characteristic of the meaning of the word *religio*. Herein a specifically Roman conception found expression and at once won a wide sphere of application, that was to have important consequences for the future.

It was only then that that new plumbing of the depths of Greece, that set in with the Hellenistic age, provoked the full development of individual Roman character. In poetry, in historical writing, in the art of oratory and, not least, in religion itself, Rome created her special forms of expression in constant struggle with her Greek model. To this we must add the defence against Oriental influences; that, too, gave occasion for Roman religion to give conscious expression to its own nature.

Not without relation to this development is the fact that Rome in an increasing measure wins a preponderance over the rest of Italy. The change from what had gone before is not fully expressed by saying that the rôle of the Italian peoples as bearers and mediators of Greek culture came to an end the moment that Rome ceased to be a mere receiver. In what she herself produces Rome emancipates herself from the tutelage of the Italians and even procures in ever

increasing degree among them acceptance for her own new creations. The Social War, which brought death to the tribal cultures of Italy, only set the seal on a process that had begun much earlier. The rôle of Italy as a 'province' in culture as opposed to the metropolis, Rome, which later found its classical expression in the Journey to Brundisium of Horace or in the romance of Petronius, already appears now and again in the Satires of Lucilius.

Of special significance in this connexion was the creation of a Roman literature on the Greek pattern.² With it there appeared on the scene a new factor, that left far behind it all previous attempts on Italian soil. Whatever we may suppose to have existed among the Etruscans and Oscans in the way of choral songs, of popular games and the like, had never got beyond an occasional character; fettered to the immediate practical requirements of the occasion, it had nowhere succeeded in rising to the autonomous quality of a literary work of art. The decision taken by Ennius in favour of Rome and the new Roman literature is symptomatic, in so far as he freed himself not only from Greek, but at the same time from Oscan.³ Plautus of Sarsina, Naevius of Campania, Pacuvius and Accius, coming from the south of Italy, confirm this picture.

The history of Roman religion in its turn reveals similar traits. The Roman colonists spread not only their language but their cult over Italy. A remarkable witness is supplied, because of their relatively early date, by the *cippi* of Pisaurum. They are a token that not only the popular tongue of Rome,⁴ but her gods,⁵ too, had taken root in the colony. With this we may associate as a matter of general principle the fact that the suppression of the Bacchanalia does not halt at the boundaries of the territory of the city of Rome; a version of the decisive decree of the senate has been found in the extreme south of the peninsula, on Bruttian soil. What is more, Roman cult forced its way into the newly conquered provinces of the West. Even in the midst of the Greek sphere, Delos did not merely form a seat of the Roman merchant-class as such—the worship of the gods that they brought with them set foot on the island, as the excavations enable us to realize.⁶

The political and military conquest of Italy and the inhabited world thus finds its counterpart in the spread of Roman culture and Roman religion. This suggests that the conquest and creation of the Empire means much more than an act of the politics of force. The process is not simply one of snatching, of appropriating other political formations; from another point of view it is a series of accidents. Rome has become something so mighty that she draws the peoples of the Mediterranean circle under her spell, that they are willing to make the sacrifice of their own character and independence. This derived from a sense that a great and necessary process was taking place, before which no other course than self-abandonment could be considered. This feeling found expression in a creation which did indeed only attain to canonical validity under the Empire, but which in its beginnings goes back into the Republican period—in the cult of the goddess, Roma. It had its origin outside Rome, among the Italian allies and the dependent communities of Greece; there men recognized in the existence of the ruling city a divine element⁷ and therefore gave a religious form to their devotion to it.

Our story has already brought us to the last days of the Republic. We stand at the gate of the age of Augustus, the climax of all Roman history. For however high we may value the youthful strength of the state of the Samnite and Punic Wars, the proof of greatness lies neither in the acquisition of power nor in its inexorable retention, but simply and solely in the resolution to produce out of it an intelligible order. Inseparable from this is the creation of a culture which shall express the consciousness of being a form and norm of universal validity. There will never be an age that will pass by the native genius of an Ennius or a Plautus, by the lonely sublimity of a Lucretius or the passion of a Catullus. Yet none of these could attain to the perfection, the dignity and clarity of a Horace or a Virgil. In the works of these, her greatest sons, Rome recognized herself, and history has confirmed the judgement on its every page.

Once again we cannot fail to see that this new and supreme development of Roman character runs parallel to a fresh plunge into the depths of Greece.⁸ The return to the great

models, the true classical works of Hellenism, is clear to see in literature, above all, in poetry. In the Augustan art, as well, it has long since been recognized. The same view must now prove its validity for the realm of religion.

Chapter II

THE ADVENT OF THE NEW AGE

1. THE END OF THE REPUBLIC

BEFORE we proceed to describe the Augustan Age as the novelty that it was, let us be permitted to pause for a moment and realize for ourselves the conditions, existing at the close of the epoch that went before it.

We must first remind ourselves that the first and second epochs of imitation of Greece (to retain an expression once coined) in their historical course represent no single and consecutive process. The two are separated by a considerable interval, within which the Greek element and its influence fell quite into the background. This phenomenon is characteristic not only of the state-religion of Rome, still less of Rome alone, but of the whole realm of Central Italian culture. Two periods of intellectual development, distinct in their nature, are separated here by a hiatus in history.

In the history of the earlier Roman religion, if anywhere, is revealed the truth that a classification by epochs is not merely something applied by the separating and sorting intellect to the movement of history, but that that very movement is completed in distinct stages, clearly demarcated from one another. Once again, before that third epoch, which represents a new and deepened grasp of the Greek model, the Augustan, goes a period which may once again be conceived of as a decline from that model. But this cannot now be said in the sense that the continuity was interrupted, but that the interest of Rome was diverted from the truly classical expressions of the Greek spirit, that is to say, from that which we must regard as its nature in the deepest and most fundamental sense.

As early as the beginning of the third century, it is true,

immediate contact with Greece had been attained and Greek culture had been sought out at the fountain-head. Yet this step in advance, fruitful in results as it was, did not mean a complete grasp and appropriation of Greek culture. Especially in the field of religion it appears that interest was directed less to the great and eternally valid creations of the Greek mind than to anything that was immediately offered. What came to be comprehended was what lay nearest to hand—and that not only in a local, but also in a temporal sense—that is to say, the latest 'modern' phase of the development of Greek religion.

We have already emphasized how characteristic it is that the cult of Asklepios of Epidaurus was the first to be taken over. Its late growth can still in some measure be observed ; ¹ it was just towards the close of the fourth and the beginning of the third century that it gained a wide extension at other places in the Hellenistic world. By the side of it the newly acquired south of Italy and Sicily, above all, the conquest of the East itself, involved an extensive growth of Oriental cults and deities. This again implied contact with a world that had just begun to reconstitute itself and to draw wider circles within its ban. Whilst the Greek motherland as a creative centre from the beginning of the Hellenistic epoch fell into the background, there was formed here a religion that drew its peculiar strength from penetration from the East. In increasing measure it determined the physiognomy of the new age.

This development of Roman religion, not so much based on systematic thinking as carried away by external events, had a consequence that, strange as it may appear at first, was none the less inevitable. Setting out with the endeavour to understand the Greek element in an original and not in a derived form, it yet became more and more separated from what was in the true sense Greek, from what it had first been inspired to attain. Instead of Hellenism it was its deformations, the hellenized Orient, astrology, Persian and Chaldaean lore and sacred prostitutes, that came to Rome and threatened to gain the upper hand there.

In the last decades of the Republic the motley and grotesque character of the picture rather increases than the

reverse. Above all others, the cult of Isis and Serapis endeavours to set foot from Campania in Rome. Four times in the course of a mere ten years must its shrines be broken down, its divine images shattered; so obstinate was the encroachment of the strangers, so unsuccessful the measures taken by the state in defence—a little more and it would have come to the foundation of a temple at public expense. At the same time, the evocation of spirits and magic practices of all kinds flourished. A proper representative of this tendency is seen in the person of Nigidius Figulus, whose activities were by no means exhausted by his Neo-Pythagoreanism, but extended to anything that could please an age that craved the miraculous.² We may spare ourselves the trouble of going into further details. The history of Roman religion is not the loser if it gives no more than superficial attention to these variegated and lively, but essentially dreary and muddled practices. To all that concerns its proper subject, that which we might term the religious idea of Rome, which finds its grandest expression in the Augustan epoch, it certainly represents no more than a foil.

With the last we may connect another point of view. For the development that we have just sketched, there was another condition required—the growth of a mob, without land or possessions, uprooted from its native soil; it crowded into a few cities, above all, into Rome. Its appearance, coinciding with the decline of the small and middle class of peasants and with the influx of strangers of all kinds into the growing capital city of the inhabited world, made possible the entrance and settlement of a form of religious thought absolutely opposed to the original Roman.³ Characterized externally by ecstasy, by the emphasis on the mysterious and on the exclusion of the uninitiated, its main features represented all the same something different and of much greater importance. What it really means is simply this—that for the first time the deeply ignoble instincts of the weak and inferior forced their way to dominance, the craving for inner satisfaction and for the peace of the soul, an individual demand for salvation after death, the cry for a revelation that shall help to the attainment of that salvation; in fact, all those characteristics that M. Weber

has aptly described as 'the religious feelings of those lacking social privilege'.⁴ Human life now finds in that continued existence after death not its close, but its goal and its fulfilment, instead of, as before, perfecting itself even in this life by the conscious exaltation of after-fame.

Through this appearance of new streams of thought and of new strata of the population, who were its bearers, a cleavage arose within a world that up till then had been solid and single. The effects of this cleavage were the more lasting, because the nobility in their turn regarded it as their task to maintain the traditional religion of the state against the new tendencies. Now for the first time that religion was deliberately apprehended by the leading class of the community as a creation of Roman individuality and, as such, defended against the encroaching foreign cults. Rome's character, Rome's gods and Rome's state were conceived of as one inseparable unity, the state representing the centre assigned to the other two.

We have already discussed the single stages of this fight and the arguments which were brought into the field in favour of the suppression of the foreign element. Supported by the forces of the state, the nobility succeeded, as far as appearances went at least, in carrying its point of view to triumph. But the moment that 'war on the rule of the senate' became the cry, the national religion was at once drawn most vigorously into the conflict. This happened the more readily because the ruling class did not merely defend it, but actually regarded it as their special possession and exploited it in ever-increasing measure for political purposes.

How far the common view of the matter could venture to go is illustrated by the quarrel between the two augurs, Appius Claudius Pulcher and C. Claudius Marcellus. The latter went so far as to assert that the discipline of the augurs was no more than a political institution, no true revelation of the divine will (Cicero, *de leg.* 2, 18, 82; *de div.* 2, 35, 75). From this it is no long way to those abuses which are familiar above all from the closing years of the Republic.

Beside the office of the augurs, it was with the quindecimviri and the pontifices that utilization of the office for

political purposes set in. The possession of the dignity of chief priest, above all, was always the aim of the ruling family, and had at the same time set its seal on its position.⁶ It was on these colleges, then, that the attack on the nobility was concentrated. A resolution of the people in the year 103 produced an important change in the method of filling these priesthoods. The right of co-option, hitherto enjoyed, was withdrawn from the pontifices and the other high colleges, and in its place was put popular choice, though the actual right of appointment was reserved to those colleges;⁶ the age of Sulla brought only a passing change in these arrangements. With this the authority of the priestly tradition, which could only be maintained inside a comparatively limited circle, was broken. The extensive decay of the whole religious system, which found expression not only in the order of the calendar,⁷ but also in the lore of the auspices and prodigies, will have been traced, probably rightly, to this innovation.

With this repulse of the nobility, other priesthoods, that in themselves had not been drawn into political intrigue, likewise moved towards their decline. This is particularly true of the office of *flamen Dialis*. It was burdened with a very exact ceremonial that made deep demands on the personal life of its bearer; for full seventy-five years, from the death of L. Cornelius Merula (87 B.C.) to the age of Augustus, no one was found who would undertake it. Further, the offices of the twelve minor *flamines* were in this period only partially filled, and some of the priestly societies, such as those of the Arval Brethren and the Titii, had entirely disappeared.

Towards the close of the Republic, then, things had reached such a pitch that the attention of the age was diverted not only from the principal figures of the Greek world of gods, but also from the revered institutions of native Roman religion. We do not mean to say that the age had entirely lost its belief in the gods,⁸ but that an attitude alien both to Greek and Roman character had ousted the remembrance of the forms of a great past. Under these circumstances the knowledge of the gods of Rome and the cult of the state, so far as it was still preserved, found refuge in another place

in the scientific study of antiquities that had been called into being by the Stoa. To understand this process, we must briefly discuss the adoption of Greek philosophy in Rome and its relation to the native gods and cults.

Philosophy, we all know, is the criminal to whose destructive influence a large share in the decay of the state religion is usually assigned. In our modern treatises, then, beside the overwhelming influx of Hellenistic and Oriental religions, the 'enlightenment', that is to say, the rationalistic speculations about the gods, appears as a chief actor. This view to-day is in need of certain modifications, especially of a more vigorous emphasis on the positive services that philosophy rendered to religion.

In philosophy there is without doubt present a tendency that, although not expressly directed against the religion of the state, might be regarded from its consequences as being aimed against it. Ennius with his translation of Euhemerus set the example here. Next in order, it was the teaching of Epicurus that was felt to be directed against the native gods and, therewith, against the state itself. That was the reason why the forces of the state were brought into operation against this teaching, as they had been against the Bacchanalia and similar institutions. In the year 154^a followed the expulsion of the Epicureans, Alcius and Philiscus, *οἱ δὲ ἐλεγκοῦντο ἡθονάς* (Athen. 12, 547 A), after, seven years before, the same measure had been applied to all philosophers, the rhetoricians included. The measure was, however, of no far-reaching importance, for the school of Epicurus was soon to fall far behind the Stoa in Rome. It was not till the last years of the Republic that an impressive apostle of the school arose in the person of Lucretius.

Of a passionate polemic against religion, based on the deepest personal conviction, this whole poem of Lucretius is full, and at once, in the magnificent lines of the prelude, Epicurus is celebrated as the victor who cast to the ground that dire figure of *religio* that lowered on men from heaven. No more than in Epicurus, of course, is the attack directed against the gods in themselves. Lucretius could not remain insensible to the sublime tones of religious language and has often given expression to them in his poem—his enthusiasm

for his master rises to an almost religious grandeur—nor could he withdraw himself from the influence of the great figures of the Greek heaven. In the marvellous prelude to the Third Book the conception of Epicurus as the deliverer from superstition and fear of death takes form in the contrast between the heavenly mount of the gods, with its radiant joy and its unsullied peace, and the fields of Acheron, lying deep down in the darkness of earth. Or, again, at the opening of the whole work stands the picture of Venus and her divine working, which is invoked to lend success to Lucretius's own undertaking. The reality and greatness of Aphrodite—for Venus is no other than her—has hardly anywhere else in ancient literature found such a representation, such an inspired proclamation.¹⁰ The attack of Lucretius, then, is directed against another object—against the mystifications of seers and interpreters of dreams, against the cruelties of sacrifice, against signs and wonders and, not least, against the enslavement of the soul by the belief in the beyond and the fear of death.

In this polemic we see as in a mirror all that we have seen to be characteristic of the last century of the Republic. We meet the procession of the Mother of the gods to the sound of orgiastic ravings and dances (2, 600 f.), we meet the Pythagorean, Ennius, with his dream of Homer; there, too, we meet again all the restless curiosity of the age that was directed towards the beyond and the future destinies of the soul. All this is seen and attacked under the specifically Roman form of *religio*—the Roman and Italian tinge is scarcely ever wanting, whether it be question of the *parentatio* with the sacrifice of black bulls (3, 51 f.), or the description of the grim punishments of hell, in which the walls of the Etruscan grave-chambers are so rich. Cicero did not disdain to pour the streams of his chill ridicule on a school that praised its founder as the deliverer from dreads, in which scarcely any old woman still believed (*Tuscul.* 1, 48). From the standpoint of the Roman nobility, that banished all such elements from *religio* into *superstitio* or passed over them in philosophic enlightenment, this might seem justifiable enough. But what Lucretius aimed at hitting and did indeed hit was that world of Oriental deities,

of belief in the beyond and those magical practices that had their sure and unshakable seat, if not among the nobility, in the middle and lower classes of the population. That the genuine popular belief of Rome itself was not unfamiliar with the conception of ghostly and destructive powers of hell, of their grotesque monsters and the like, has been proved by an investigation of the Mother of the Lares.¹¹

What is remarkable in the effects of Epicurus is that his teaching could count among its adherents not only a Lucretius, but also, at one time, the young Horace and Virgil. This early discipleship of men, who later were among the reformers of Roman religion, shows that, from the point of view of that religion, there was something more than a merely negative criticism of gods and cult. As we shall see later, what is of the essence of the age of Augustus is its deliberate reconception and inward assimilation of the great historical values of Rome, those of its religion included. After all that had preceded it, such an attitude is only possible as a fresh and free choice. And this again implies as its cause an inner independence that alone can permit such a choice, an independent spiritual decision taking the place of a merely traditional connexion of nature and blood with the past of one's nation. The creation of this necessary condition of mind, this freedom from bonds of mere custom, even in the face of the traditional gods of Rome, may perhaps be regarded as a part of the historical mission of Epicurus and those who followed him.

We must treat the Stoa as summarily here as we have treated Epicureanism, although its importance was incomparably greater. When it first set foot in Rome, mainly through the work of Panaetius and the decisive influence of the Scipionic circle, its theology came with it. Especially impressive was the division, going back probably to Panaetius himself, of religion into three parts—political, mythical and natural. The idea that it was the statesmen who, as lawgivers in divine matters as in earthly, had placed in men's hearts the belief in divine power, before that belief was shaped and decorated by the poets, before it was raised by the philosophers to true purity and dignity—this idea, I repeat, did not fail in its effect on the members of the

senatorial aristocracy, who clustered round the circle of the younger Scipio.¹² But there were other sides of the new doctrine, of a far more positive nature, that were not slow to come to the fore.

No other philosophic system worked as inspiringly and fruitfully on the Roman spirit as did the Stoa. Its ethic became one of the models of Roman conduct; for many a special discipline did the Stoa supply the foundations; perhaps the systematization of law,¹³ certainly the science of language of an Aelius Stilo,¹⁴ grew up on its soil. Now came the age when the Stoa was to intervene decisively in the history of Roman religion as well. The Stoic theology, which, like every philosophic system of religious teaching, aimed rather at a purification and cleansing than at a criticism of existing religions, began, as soon as it was transplanted to Roman soil, to work back on Roman belief. By its interpretation in terms of allegory and physics it had already dealt with the divine world of Greece; it had now to do the same with what it found in the Roman sphere.

To have brought this to pass was the achievement of a single man, M. Terentius Varro,¹⁵ even if this side of his activities may have meant but one among many in the frame of his whole work. Of the forty-one books of his *antiquitates rerum humanarum et divinarum*, the last sixteen were concerned with divine matters. There, too, as in the first half, a classification by men, places, times and subjects was carried through (cp. Augustine, *de civ. Dei* 6, 3). Under these rubrics were discussed, first the priesthoods, then the temples and dedicated sites, the festivals and games; finally, in the fourth part, consecration, as well as the *sacra privata* and *publica*. A fifth and final section dealt with the gods, one book each being devoted to the *di certi* and *incerti*. In a special third book, '*de diis praecipuis et selectis*', a number of gods was again treated and a physical explanation of their nature was given.

The whole represented a comprehensive attempt to portray the whole of Roman religion from Stoic foundations. This treatment of the whole mighty material, that was never repeated in the same fullness, was, even in antiquity, of lasting importance and, in its remains, is so even to this day.

But the division into *di certi* and *incerti*¹⁶ at once shows that even the comprehensive learning of a Varro could not succeed in completely explaining the meaning of all that he touched in his work. There were gods whom he found present in the lists of the *pontifices*, without being able to find out anything about their nature and function.

True to the Stoic view that the etymology (*veriloquium*) of a word or name may be able to contribute something to the explanation of the idea or object covered by it, Varro tried to fill in these gaps in his knowledge by suitable linguistic interpretations. Into the etymological value of these attempts we need not enter here, but we must not pass over the historical principles involved. Varro's undertaking represents an advance beyond the customary attitude of the Stoa. In that, men were content to be able to interpret gods of common knowledge on the ground of linguistic science and a religious philosophy of a physical character;¹⁷ but the interest of Varro goes on to find its outlet in antiquarianism. He is no longer content to give a deeper meaning in a new sense to known facts; his aim is to throw light on what has passed out of knowledge and has become antiquated. Just as in Varro's science of language the Roman tendency to antiquarianism is manifest beside that traditional for the Greek Stoa,¹⁸ so is it in this particular case.

We thus reach another point of cardinal importance — the collection of the material of religious antiquities as such. It won an enormous importance, because it took place at a moment when the knowledge of the old customs and cults was threatening to disappear entirely. Varro began his treatment of the *res divinae* in the fifties, at a time when the decay of the state religion, of which we have spoken, was already an accomplished fact. Whether it was his pronounced intention to save what could still be saved of the sacred knowledge cannot be decided. But probably from the first his work had that tendency. Cicero emphasizes its importance from this point of view in fine and memorable language: (*Acad. post.* 1, 9) *nam nos in nostra urbe peregrinantis errantisque tamquam hospites tui libri quasi domum reducerunt, ut possemus aliquando qui et ubi essemus agnoscere. Tu aetatem patriae, tu descriptiones temporum,*

tu sacrorum iura, tu sacerdotum, tu domesticam, tu bellicam disciplinam, tu sedem regionum, locorum, tu omnium divinarum humanarumque rerum nomina, genera, officia, causas aperuisti . . .

What had already been suggested had, then, actually taken place; Roman religion had freed itself from its connexion with the state, a connexion which was not only present for it from the first, but which seemed to be proper to its nature, and had taken refuge in the arms of the Stoic theology and of a science based upon it. This seemed to seal the fate of that religion. And yet it had not succumbed to the hostile forces; immediately before it stood a new and glorious resurrection.

That very spiritual sphere in which the ruins of Roman religion seemed to have found a place of refuge on their way to a quiet and slow decay, that very realm, by virtue of an inward dialectic, drove them out again to a new activity. The occupation of the Roman antiquarians with the sacred antiquities did not mean, what philological and antiquarian research has so often meant, a sign that their subjects have finally quitted the realm of life and actuality. The aim of every science, as of philosophy, is in its nature this—to take whatever elementary life offers it, to grasp it deliberately from its own resources and so to make out of it the norms of a new and ordered life.¹⁹ In so far, then, as the collection of the tradition of religion was an occasion for realizing its extent, its meaning and its wealth, it became also a spur to raise to the rank of a norm of national life whatever had survived this new test and thereby proved its value.²⁰

At this point we must take account of Cicero and his work, once again in a summary fashion. We have already referred to his fine appreciation of Varro. It shows that the religion of the ancestors lay much nearer Cicero's heart than has usually been realized; it is the same as with his relation to ancient Roman literature and the past of Rome in general. True, his relation to divine things in general is distinguished by a certain detachment—in contrast, we may say, to the ecstatic ceremonies of the Oriental cults of his time, to the artificial depth of the Magians and the astrologers, but equally to the passionate fight which Lucretius waged with

his enemy, *religio*. But that was an attitude and an obligation which united Cicero to his companions in rank and thought. Wherever he encountered old Roman greatness and piety, so to say, in the flesh, as in the *Somnium Scipionis*, his feeling is able to break out in tones of grandeur and sublimity. It is characteristic of him in general to show an almost jealous endeavour to maintain in his philosophic writings the rank and equality of the Roman in face of his Greek models; and so, too, wherever Greek theology operated with examples out of its own religion, he is able at once to find a suitable example out of Roman and thus to maintain the equilibrium at which he aims. In his ideal picture of sacred legislation, as sketched in the Second Book of his Laws, in the discussions attached to the single enactments, whether it is a matter of the supposed supremacy of worldly law over religious or of the importance of the discipline of the augurs, there is spread before us a wealth of true Roman conception of the activity and nature of the gods and of their cult in the state that has scarcely a parallel in Roman literature.²¹

But these are not the only things in which the special importance of Cicero for the history of Roman religion consists. It consists even more in the fact that he is a true representative of the nobility, that he again gave emphatic expression to the inner connexion of state and state-religion. This idea is fundamental in the best Roman tradition, even if the form in which the thought is propounded and based in Cicero's books on the Laws is borrowed from Greek philosophy. At least in principle, something is here maintained which was to find its incomparably stronger expression in the attitude of the age of Augustus—stronger just because, there, execution was added to intention, to planning the act.

These last years of the Republic show us two faces. On the one hand, the fall of the religion of the state seems to be sealed; on the other, the signs of a revolution make themselves known, which deliberately goes back to the great past of Roman religion and endeavours to give new life to its values. The change in the attitude to cult is continued in a changed relation to the gods themselves. Whilst in

the one view these gods seemed to have abandoned Rome finally to her own resources, elsewhere a new hope appears. It is in poetry that this contrast has found its expression.

The 16th Epode of Horace is full to overflowing of the pictures of despair—despair of the future of Rome, the dread that the barbarians of the East may succeed in a task which remained forbidden to a Porsenna or a Hannibal. The only resource is to follow the example of the Phocaeans and abandon the native home. In the distance, in the Islands of the Blessed, Jupiter will grant a new abode,²² after he has laid on the dwellers on earth an even harder lot.

Against this gloomy picture, in which the heavenly powers seemed to have turned away from sin-laden humanity, the prophecy of Virgil rises in radiant confidence in the future. The iron age, so the Fourth Eclogue tells us, shall come to an end and a new age of gold shall rise, incorporated in the birth and growth of a divine child. When he has at last reached man's estate, earth will go forward to a new destiny. It will be full of events of wonder and its inhabitants will be raised above all distress.²³

The contrast between these two conceptions is the more remarkable, as the two poems unmistakably take account of one another. There is, then, a deliberate emphasizing of the difference, even if we cannot say with certainty which can claim priority in time. Yet another poem in the collection of Bucolic poems refers to Horace's Epode, and this time we can with certainty assign priority in time to the latter²⁴—I mean, the First Eclogue of Virgil. It again opposes to the pictures of strife and decline something new, the belief in the greatness of an individual. This will form the subject of our next section.

2. VIRGIL'S FIRST ECLOGUE

It has been observed that in ancient Rome it is never the great and towering figure that has made history, but that all the effects proceed from circles of like-minded men who are either connected with one another by family ties or else, as in the circle of Scipio, are grouped round one family as their centre. It is actually true that only at the close of

the Republic does the emergence of great individualities as such begin.²⁵

What is thus stated in general terms is especially true of Roman religion. In the case of the Tarquins themselves—much in contrast to the contemporary tyrants of South Italy or the Greek motherland—their historical achievement can only be grasped as that of the whole line, without our being able to assign a definite share to any individual king. The idea that the imperfections of tradition may be chiefly responsible for this judgement is refuted by the age that followed. It is never an individual that made history as religious reformer or innovator. Even a Q. Ogulnius, with whom is associated not only the law bearing his name, that gave the plebeians admission to the priesthoods, but also the transference of Aesculapius and the adoption of a silver coinage on the Greek model—even he is not to be understood without regard to the Fabii who were his political backers.²⁶

Quite different is the case with Sulla and Caesar, with Augustus too. Horace himself, in one of his most mature and perfect poems, called his own age after the last named (c. 4, 15, 4). The introduction of the religious reforms is again the most personal work of the Emperor. The measure in which he exercised a decisive interference in the history of the state-religion is proved not only by the execution of the work itself, but also by the importance which it won for the future. With it was established a norm which remained in force till the end of paganism. It was an individual, then, who determined the future course of Roman religion.

Again the truth is revealed that it is the great individuals who give to human history its final meaning and its last and highest form. It is remarkable how for centuries the history of Roman religion, agreeing herein with political history, remained anonymous, inasmuch as its bearers were the whole people or its ruling class as a whole—remarkable, too, how at its climax it was by the work of an individual that the fulfilment ensued of all that from the first had been intended and resolved within it.

It will always remain noteworthy how early and how tenaciously Augustus's own age recognized his importance. For ancient feeling this recognition found shape in the idea

that in Augustus something divine had been revealed in human form. It was the young Virgil who first, in the introductory poem of his *Eclogues*, gave shape to the belief in Octavian as a god.

It is true of the *Eclogues*, as it is not true of any of the poems of the Catalepton, that their author had already found his predestined classical form. This is expressed not only in the formal disposition, but also in the fact that everything merely personal, in the way of passions and sentiments, is discarded. Everywhere is manifest a new tendency that presses on to great suprapersonal concerns, whether they be taken from nature and the cosmos or from the events of a stirring present. This change of tendency further implies that Virgil in one decisive point had gone beyond his immediate model, Theocritus. The delight in the little world of the country and in its naïve joys is no longer an end in itself, but is subordinated to those new, incomparably greater aims.

It must be admitted, on the other hand, that the law of the poetic genre is strong enough to draw the subjects that intrude on it from outside anew within its ban. Even where they are immediately at work, they work still only within the limits of a very clearly defined bucolic form. Even the most violent and bitter experience of life can be so transformed that the necessities of an existence of a different order to the bucolic only play upon it from a distance, without disturbing for more than a moment its peace and harmony.

This retention of a definitely bucolic form can everywhere be observed, where for a moment the note of sentimental idyll seems to be interrupted. But every conflict that thus arises, and all the excitement that attends such conflict, is again tuned to those gentle tones that are definitive of the bucolic mood. This peculiarity of the genre that we have sketched may work itself out in the most diverse ways, not only in description and narrative, but, above all, in the setting of the tone of the conversation. There is a bucolic style of life and the conduct of life; there is a bucolic style, too, in the way in which spiritual experience is expressed in a succession, to be unfolded in question and answer. It

consists in an attentiveness to almost imperceptible nuances of meaning, in the finest interruptions and turns of the conversation not least in the observance of an extreme urbanity in its apparently country dress, and in a restraint which recoils from any expression that might even in the most remote way infringe the rights of one's neighbour.

The First Eclogue,²⁷ in higher degree than any other except the Fourth, has taken up into itself topical events.²⁸ Events of which the poet himself had been witness stand behind the poem, not to find their reflection in it, but rather to be raised to an ideal poetic plane which can look away from the actual fact as such.

Into the remoteness of country life another world has forced its way. Meliboeus and many of his peers must leave their ancestral acres to make room for soldiers, alien to the country. If Tityrus has been able to retain his property, he owes it to the intervention of a mighty one—of a god, as he puts it. The two characters are, therefore, expressed in contrast, Tityrus resting lazily under the shadow of an oak and playing his flute, the other going his way with his weary flock. In this contrast of their postures is expressed vividly the contrast of their destinies.

Thus the speech of Meliboeus takes its beginning from the almost unimaginable luck of his companion, then turns to his own misfortune, to return at the end to that picture of blissful contentment. In his answer Tityrus adopts the same line of thought, moving to and fro between two poles (*tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi . . . nos . . . nos patriam fugimus; tu, Tityre . . .*). But with him the movement is not to and fro from himself to his opposite, but from the gratefully accepted luck of his present position he rises to the god, to whom he owes the peace of his undisturbed existence. The conversation is thus diverted from its first poles (Meliboeus and Tityrus) to new poles (Tityrus and the god), and Meliboeus duly takes up the new direction. He does so, actually, by contrasting portents. The burden of his fortune constrains him to set over against the kindly god of Tityrus and the blessings that he has conferred, his own ill-luck and the ill-omens which proclaimed to him in advance the will of heaven. From the confronting of these two

opposites rises necessarily the wondering question, who then can the god be of whom Tityrus speaks, (*iste deus qui sit*, 18).

We have now reached a point at which the difficulties of interpretation usually begin. They are to be found, first, in the external form in which this question is put. The question in itself was implied in the first astonishment of Meliboeus (v. 11), but the thread of thought, it has been supposed, was then lost in the individual ill-luck of the speaker and all the details about it; the question, then, could only be reached by a violent break.²⁹ It remains remarkable, too, that the question is asked about the god and that yet his name is not mentioned. Even if we could see intention in this, in the desire for the mysterious, it is still remarkable that the final answer (vv. 40-5) really says no more than was hinted in the opening verses (6-10). The conclusion clearly was that the poet was not in the least concerned with the answer itself, nay rather, deliberately avoided it. All he intended was to create an excitement, a guess in the hearer, and then leave him in this state of uncertainty.³⁰

In contrast to this we must give sharper expression to the last result of our interpretation. We said that the question of Meliboeus (v. 18) grew out of a contrast of feeling. He himself had noted, even before, signs from the gods; they had been of an unfavourable kind for him, and the issue had confirmed his forebodings (vv. 16-17). In the face of these gods, who had foretold disaster and brought it to pass, the question irresistibly presented itself, how was this god of Tityrus distinguished from those baleful powers, whose working Meliboeus had had to rue in his own person?

It is no case of 'interruption', then, but out of the movement and counter-movement the decisive question arises. This at once gives us a solution to the other difficulty. True, verses 40-5, regarded by themselves, give us nothing new as against verses 6-10, even if the tone has risen appreciably in the direction of dignity and majesty. But through what precedes those verses, the journey of Tityrus to Rome, which we shall have soon to discuss, something new has really been added, which is equivalent to an answer to the question of Meliboeus. It was no god of the kind that expressed itself in lightning and signs in heaven (cp. 17 *de caelo tactas . . . quercus*), but he was a dweller on earth; in Rome he was present in the flesh (41 *praesentis . . . divos*) and afforded his support to the suppliant.

After all, then, something new is added to the opening words (6-10).³¹ We can escape the necessity of attributing to the first Eclogue the peculiarity of letting one person pose a direct question about the god and yet of giving him no answer to his question—not even an explanation of the subject of it.³² We may even affirm that with the mention of Rome the sphere of operations

of the god is defined and that, with that, the deciding word has been said. That the name of Octavian should not be uttered, that it should remain an unexpressed secret, needs no further explanation. Every one must recognize who was meant and, as a matter of fact, there has never been any doubt on the point.

But we have as yet only solved a part of the difficulties bound up with the structure of the poem. The god, we have seen, is from the outset the real concern of the poem. First expressed with all possible emphasis on his activities (*deus nobis haec otia fecit; namque erit ille . . . illius aram . . . ille meos errare boves . . .*), then contrasted with his dark opposite (vv. 16-17), this 'god' compels the question about his origin and character. Although the goal is thus clearly defined, many detours are still required before it is reached. And let us not omit to note this point—the farther that the thought seems to diverge from this goal, the duller grows the interest of the interlocutor. The excitement that found expression at the first in his question grows fainter and fainter. The minor events of a shepherd's life seem to hold him captive, and it is only at the close, as if by chance, that the expected word is uttered. In Rome, where Tityrus was staying to buy his freedom, the miracle occurred that the god met him and gave him back his property.

A strange form of composition, indeed. Or was the intention just the reverse: was the excitement roused by the question not to slip from consciousness, but to accompany the whole first part of the poem? Ought we to see, not a sinking into secondary matters, but a considered management of the conversation, using all means to one end, leading up by a gradual crisis to the main point, the answer to the question put in verses 40-5?

The idea is at least worthy of consideration. We must call to mind what we said by way of preface. The bucolic style, we realized, has its special form of dialogue, too. It avoids the loud and immediate, it softens down contrasts, tones down their harshness to a mere allusion. The supreme law is that anything that could even appear as a violation of personal rights, of the private affairs of a fellow-mortal, must be avoided. Allusions, questions, demands, when they are unavoidable, must only be made with all possible

restraint. It is only, then, by following the most apparently trivial nuances of conversation that we can really grasp the structure of the whole.

In our case, then, Meliboeus has put in due form the question about the god who has helped Tityrus. Tityrus begins at once to give his report, and even if he goes back a long way, longer, perhaps, than his questioner had anticipated, the latter must nevertheless gather from the beginning of the story that he had been understood in his request for enlightenment. If Tityrus chose to begin with Rome, but then to weave in a survey of his earlier life, Meliboeus must be content. A repeated question, even a reminder of the first, is in the bucolic sphere inadmissible, and the same is fundamentally true of all places in which men have the feeling for the laws of 'urbane' conversation, whether it be the Athens of Platonic dialogue or that other society, so different in its externals, in which the interlocutors in the writings of Cicero move. Expressed positively, this means that Meliboeus is still allowed to hold his companion's narrative on its course by hints or detailed inquiries; whether it will run in the direction that he desires is a matter of luck or of the skill with which he can imperceptibly guide the narrator.

Meliboeus understands how thus to guide him. When his opposite number has brought to an end his enthusiastic praise of Rome, praise which in its last verses admits of no further heightening, Meliboeus is clever enough to get round this stoppage, leading him to continue by interposing a question about the purpose of his journey. Behind it lies the expectation, a correct one, of course, that it must have been in Rome that the decisive encounter with the god took place. But this expectation is not obtruded. It is left to chance whether the general question will succeed in bringing the narrator to the special point in which the questioner was from the first interested.

At first, it is true, this does not seem to be the case. Tityrus goes even farther back, speaks of old times, of Galatea and Amaryllis, of why his purchase of freedom was at first impossible and of why it finally succeeded. Meliboeus must patiently put up with this wandering off into details. Only when the narrator comes to an experience, in which Meliboeus has himself shared, does he again interpose. But he does so now, not in the form of a (direct) question or of the (more indirect) inquiry, for both have been exhausted, but, to avoid every appearance of importunity, he must restrict himself to giving expression to the anxious impatience with which Amaryllis awaited the return of Tityrus. He forces the picture of this impatient waiting before the eyes of himself and his friend, shapes it into a graceful scene—and, in so doing, in the feelings of Amaryllis the excitement of the speaker himself is imperceptibly reflected, about how things

went in Rome, and whether it was not there that the encounter with the god took place. And in this very excitement is uttered the significant word: sadly did the girl in the absence of Tityrus call upon the *gods* (v. 41) and bring them her gift. Now there is no escaping the result: Tityrus is bound at this cue to come back to his god, if he has not quite forgotten him. What was planned and expected is now fulfilled. In Rome, when he had completed his purchase of freedom, Tityrus experienced the helping hand of the god and heard the words, in which he left the suppliant in possession of his own.³³

We are now able—this is the first success that we can record—to understand the structure of the conversation as consistent and intelligible. The poet does not allow his characters to be tempted by various lively and circumstantial ideas into being diverted at once from the central question and losing themselves in them. The interest in the answer remains as lively as ever in *Meliboeus*—so lively, in fact, that he always succeeds by skilful interpellations and comments in bringing his friend back to the real subject whenever he seems to be getting lost. This first attempt at interpretation does not, it is true, tell us why Virgil preferred this complicated and apparently digressing line of thought to the far simpler and more convincing one of making Tityrus go directly to Rome to recover his possessions. There must have been a powerful motive to make the poet disdain that obvious structure and to link the motif of the reinstatement with that of the purchase of freedom.³⁴

To answer this question we must briefly consider how the two motifs are graded in relation to one another. The attainment of freedom is certainly of quite especial importance for Tityrus; nothing is omitted to make us realize this. But despite the strong colours this motif, in the structure of the whole, remains a secondary one. It is subordinated to the other motif, that of the god; to him, not to liberty, is devoted the part-song of the two, that takes up the whole of the second half of the poem. However great the other event might be, it was accomplished within the realm of human possibilities. In the other case it was something entirely unexpected, something inconceivable, that occurred. The encounter with the god meant no more or less than that the most coveted blessing that Tityrus had

been able to imagine, freedom, was now outdone. The passion with which he had desired it is expressed in picturesque and descriptive verses, 27 f.; pregnant and powerful, on the other hand is set against it the picture of the god and the brief word in which Tityrus's destiny was spoken.

The view here outlined only attains its full importance, however, when we briefly recall to mind the structure of the second half of the poem. It has been justly remarked that a new element in contrast to the first half now sets in.³⁵ Here begins a free flow of expression, in which feeling finds unchecked vent. If the contrary fates are again confronted, this is now done in a different manner. We have no longer a reproachful astonishment, a quarrelling with what must remain unalterable, but a visible prostration before the divine miracle. And at the same time the contrast of the two destinies is not expressed in the form of a dialogue, where each tells of himself and his plight, but one voice (that of Meliboeus) now takes the lead, gathering into one the duality of experience. It includes both elements, of congratulation and lament, and all that the other adds is limited to personal emphasis and sympathy.

In detail it is so ordered that the praise of the man, to whom home and property remains assured (46-58), culminates in a vow—never to let perish from his heart the image of the god who has worked such a marvel (59-63). Once again is sketched the extraordinary occurrence that gave occasion and subject to the Eclogue. The counterpart, the lament for what has been lost (64-78), begins with the same event. One last time Meliboeus rises to passionate lamentation, when he includes in one farewell glance all that he has lost; but immediately gentler tones intervene, which transfigure the picture of the unreturning past into a sentimental sorrow. It is these same notes that Tityrus in his turn strikes; he shapes them into an offer of a place of rest for the coming night at least to the homeless wanderer. The painful experience of the individual passes into the elegiac mood of twilight and so into the embrace of the great world of nature. Nature takes the pain into herself, to still and purify it—a conclusion comparable to that of the second Eclogue, where Corydon in the advancing peace of evening

finds his way back from his ravings to composure and appeasement.

Even the ancient commentators had to concern themselves with the question, how far Virgil's own experience is to be seen in this poem. The answer to this question is of importance for the biography of Virgil, but it is not of importance for the interpretation of the Eclogue as a planned and unitary work of art; as such, it is entirely intelligible in itself. If we can recognize what experience lay behind the poem and in what forms it was then expressed, it may mean a valuable addition to the interpretation that we have already drawn from the poem itself; but it can mean no more than that. The poem is not only intelligible in itself, but it directly avoids leading us to ask directly after the personal background. It seems even to have been the poet's intention not to let any such personal experiences show through, but rather to hide and obscure them.³⁶ It is not subjective experience, but the realization and experience of something objective, that is the aim and content of the poem.

Our analysis of the structure of the poem has been so exhaustive because thus alone can the decisive fact be made to appear; the 'god' is the very centre of the Eclogue. To him, to his character and his person, the structure of the first half is directed; on him and his word the whole of the second part depends. And it is not so ordered that a mere subjective feeling, a personal sense of gratitude, allots this unique position to the man, Octavian. For the moment, it is true, he is god for Tityrus and for none but him; this fact is expressly emphasized (v. 7; 63).³⁷ But that does not mean that this divinization is a mere personal resolution, an act of poetic caprice. Rather, we have to do with a genuine experience which, however, has this peculiarity, that in the first place it fell to Tityrus and to him alone. The divine is everywhere no mere projection of human feeling and will on to a higher plane, but a real and active principle that offers itself to man to understand. Such is the case here. What Tityrus achieves is, as we are expressly told, to *cognoscere* (41) the new god, that is to say, to become aware of a fact long existent, but at first latent. It is only the time

of this becoming aware, not its quality, that distinguishes Tityrus and his poet with him from his age.

To put it in other words; it is not because Octavian has shown himself gracious to Tityrus that he now becomes a god, but rather that the act which restores to the shepherd his own property springs from the divine nature of the ruler. The act does not make the god, but the god manifests himself in the act, as a Roman god always manifests himself in such a form, in definite acts.³⁸ This is as true of Octavian's *responsum* (44) as of the stroke of lightning, mentioned just before (v. 15 f.), in which Meliboeus recognized in advance the working of baleful powers.

Realize what boldness there was in seeing in the young Octavian, immediately after the civil war, the proscriptions and the confiscations of land, the god and the deliverer (*praesentis divos* 41).³⁹ But it is not only in this first recognition of what was still hidden from the general eye and was yet to reveal itself after so short an interval, it is not in this alone that the importance of the Eclogue consists. No, that importance is revealed in the fact that it was a poet who, running ahead of his contemporaries, pointed out the way. In this rôle of the poet, not as the creator of subjective experiences, but as the interpreter and leader towards future aims that impose themselves on his age and generation, is involved one of the foundations of the new epoch; we shall have to deal with it more fully later.

Chapter III

AUGUSTUS

IN the description of the shield of Aeneas (*Aeneid* 8, 675 f.) appears at the close the magnificent picture of the decisive battle.¹ On the one side are Augustus and with him the gods of the Roman hearth; on the other, Antony, followed by the Egyptian queen and the hoard of Eastern auxiliaries. By him appear the dog-headed Anubis and the other misshapen demons of an alien faith; they strive against Neptune, Venus, Minerva. In the mêlée Apollo gives the decision; his bow scares away the gods of the East.

By the side of the picture of the poet we may set a passage from Suetonius (*Augustus* 93). Augustus, we hear, only dedicated himself to such of the Eastern cults as were inherited from far distant ancestors; the others he rejected. That was why he respected the secret of the Eleusinian Mysteries, but, when he was travelling in Egypt, omitted to visit the sacred bull, although it would have needed but a short journey.² He is said, too, to have praised his grandson, Gaius, because on his journey in the East he did not stop in Jerusalem to offer his prayers there.

The two pieces of evidence yield a single picture—aversion from Oriental cult, return to the ancestral gods of Rome, whether to the native Roman gods or to the borrowed world of gods from Greece. In this second circle one name appears in a place of privilege—Apollo. In saying this we have sketched some of the most important religious principles of the Augustan Age. They imply a complete turning away from the development that had gone immediately before them. This is true not only in the negative sense, that they are opposed to the gods of the East, but in their positive devotion to the great creations of Greek and Roman religion.

1. In the year 28 B.C. was dedicated the temple that at once gave its stamp to the new epoch. Situated on the Palatine, it belonged in the first instance to Apollo, in the second to his divine mother and sister as his companions (Propertius 2, 81, 15 f.). Of the splendour of the new shrine and the wealth of works of art with which it was equipped, the literary tradition has much to tell us; no certain traces of it have yet been found.³ But it is plain enough what this foundation meant. Built on a part of the imperial palace, *in solo privato*, then, the temple represented the thanks for the help that Apollo had given in the wars against Sextus Pompey and Antony. But, more than this, Apollo was now selected to take his place beside the Capitoline deities as chief divinity of the state. This intention is proved not only by the institution of the Secular Games of Augustus, which we shall have soon to discuss, but also by the new arrangements about the Sibylline Books. After taking over the office of *pontifex maximus* in 12 B.C., Augustus put in hand a revision of the Books, and had them transferred from the cellar of the temple of Capitoline Juppiter, where they had up to then been placed, to the new shrine on the Palatine. This measure has been rightly taken to mean that the seat of Apollo was thereby made the centre of the whole *græcus ritus*, standing under the direction of the college, once of *Xviri*, now of *XVviri*. But even more important is the second point: that the sacred oracles, which had determined the action of the state in countless cases, were now loosed from their connexion with the highest deities of the Republican community and assigned to the new house that was so intimately connected with the imperial.⁴ So, too, there is represented on the base of Sorrento the Palatine Apollo (with his mother and sister); at his feet crouches the Sibyl.⁵

Why did the choice of the Emperor fall on Apollo in particular? One explanation that has been suggested is that in the *gens Julia* the cult of the god was from of old at home, and that we have therefore merely to do with the continuation of a family tradition.⁶ Serious objections to this view have recently been raised.⁷ Without making any final decision—and the trivial quality of our tradition would

make this difficult—we may establish at this point one decisive fact.

Cumae is the seat of an ancient cult of Apollo that became authoritative for Italy, and particularly for Rome.⁸ At Cumae the god was from of old closely associated with the Sibyl, and it has recently been observed that this connexion can be traced back as far as Asia Minor.⁹ But emphasis has not yet been laid on the further fact, that in Cumae the Sibyl, represents the deciding and more important factor in the association. The building of a special temple to Apollo belongs at earliest to the close of the sixth century,¹⁰ to an age far later than the certainly ancient presence of the Sibyl in her cave below the citadel.¹¹ This primacy of the Sibyl is reflected again in that place, where the cult of Cumae was adopted, in Rome. There, too, it must be plain that the god only finds admission in the suite of the Sibylline prophecies.¹² Those prophecies have their place not in any shrine of Apollo, but on the Capitol, and it is only very much later that the god receives his own shrine.¹³

This dependence of the god on the goddess who has her home in the interior of the earth has its analogies in other directions, too. When we survey the picture of the ancient Italian and Roman god, we cannot fail to see that the gloomy sides of his figure come into great prominence as against the bright and luminous traits.¹⁴ He appears as the power that sends plague and pestilence. That is why he could be identified with the god of the underworld on Mount Soracte, the *Soranus pater*, or with the Veiovis who belongs to the same sphere (Gellius 5, 12, 12). In the shrine of Veiovis on the Capitol the cult image was modelled on a type of Apollo, which represented him with his arrows in his hand and the goat, a chthonic beast, at his feet; we may remind ourselves that the sacrifice of a goat was proper to this god in Rome.¹⁵ Particularly in the family cult of the Julian *gens* do such ideas seem to have been dominant. In Bovillae there is recorded on an inscription of Republican date a dedication to Veiovis by the *gentiles Iuliei* (CIL. 14, 2887). If, then, we may assume a cult of Apollo by the *gens*, it will have been assimilated to that of Veiovis and have been understood from his dark side, that was turned in the direction of death.

Further, the temple of Apollo on the Flaminian meadows had been vowed on the occasion of a severe plague *pro valetudine populi*. The god was therefore named *medicus* and invoked by the Vestals as *Apollo medice*, *Apollo Paeon* (Macrobius, *Sat.* 1, 17, 15). This conception was in general so widespread,¹⁶ that Livy (25, 12, 15) noted it as a peculiarity that the *ludi Apollinares* in the year 212 were instituted *victoriae, non valetudinis ergo*.¹⁷ On this occasion there appears, beside the bull, the goat, belonging to the underworld, as sacrifice to the god (Livy, *op. cit.* 13; Macrobius, *Sat.* 1, 17, 29). Into the other cults of Apollo in Italy, whether Greek or Etruscan, we cannot enter here.¹⁸ But a glance at the Apollo of Veii seems to show that here, too, it was the gloomy and baleful traits that found expression.

From such an attitude the age of Augustus was far removed. It is the dazzling figure of the Olympian god that now steps out of its former concealment. In this form, as the incorporation of divine majesty, restraint and dignified aloofness, Apollo was supremely fitted to express the tone of a 'classic' age. That was why the new epoch of Augustus was able to recognize in him the god who expressed its innermost being.

Up to now Rome had been forbidden to come into contact with the bloom of Greek culture, with the great creations of the fifth to fourth century. It had indeed run a course parallel to the archaic period and, then again, to the age of Hellenism, but precisely in those two centuries an interruption had occurred. Now the lost ground was recovered. For the first time in the course of her history Rome set about understanding the classical creations of poetry, above all, but of art as well, for what they truly were, the norm and fulfilment of Greek character, and on this model raising her own creations to a like height. It is no accident, then, but the deepest expression of the movement of the age, if it chose as its own the god who expressed better than any other the classical idea, Apollo.

It is perhaps in the Secular celebrations of the year 17 B.C. that the change in the picture of Apollo finds its most vigorous expression. It is known to us down to its very details from the Acts, preserved in the inscription,¹⁹ and in

the *Carmen* of Horace.²⁰ The belief in the coming dawn of a new age, prepared by the hopes of the last century and given expression in the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil, was here worked out within the framework of cult. In a purely external way the festival of Augustus falls apart from the series of Republican *saecula*, beginning with the year 249, and is distinguished from them, with their interval of a hundred years, by its recurrence after one hundred and ten years; ²¹ but even greater is the change in inner meaning. If, of old, men celebrated the close of a *saeculum*, at which the sin-laden old time was carried to the grave and sacrifice was accordingly made to the gods of the underworld, the new ceremonies were rather designed to introduce a fresh beginning full of happy promise. Not the nether powers, but the nurturing and benignant powers of nature were invoked, above all, the gods of heaven, who held in their hands the destinies of the commonwealth. And here appears, beside Jupiter and Juno, with equal rights, in bond with his sister Diana, Apollo. The god, who has his place in the imperial house, is set beside the ancient deities of the Capitol. In harmony with the new mood, it is no longer his baleful and dark activity that comes into prominence, but in the *Carmen* of Horace he appears, as we shall see later, as the lord of the happy future of Rome and, as such, in tune with the heavenly Jupiter and Juno, as also with the benignant and bountiful gods of the earth.

2. At the outset we tried to grasp the history of Roman religion and of Roman culture, in general, as a dialectical process, in which was assigned to Greece the rôle of awakener and quickener in the development of the specifically Roman element. It is an important confirmation of this view that that profound acceptance of the religious idea of Greece, that was implied in the appropriation of the classical form of Apollo, goes hand in hand with an equally deep and pregnant grasp of Roman religion. This finds its vent in the most diverse directions: in the restoration of ruined shrines, in the new ordering of the priestly colleges, and not least in the recognition that the reverence for the gods was one of the foundations of the Roman state and Roman character in general. Men remembered their ancient title

to fame—that it was the sense of the supernatural and the careful heeding of it in which Rome surpassed all other peoples (Cicero, *de har. resp.* 19: *pietate ac religione atque hac una sapientia, quod deorum numine omnia regi gubernarique perspeximus, omnes gentes nationesque superavimus*).

Before ever Augustus could boast of having during his sixth consulship (28 B.C.) restored no fewer than 82 temples (*Mon. Anc.* 4, 17 f.), Horace had already raised his voice to demand the same thing. In the return to the old beliefs, the visible sign of which consisted for him in the restoration of the decayed shrines, he saw the only possibility of salvation (c. 3, 6). Just as reverence for the gods had once brought the state blessing, so had the turning away from them meant the beginning of all disaster. In this context is uttered the word about the *di neglecti* (v. 7), and from this we can deduce what had always formed the contrast to the *neglegere* of the gods, the *religio*.²² This, then, for Horace meant the restoration of the temples.

Again, in the work of Livy, who on one occasion expressly celebrates the Emperor as *templorum omnium conditor ac restitutor* (4, 20, 7), such thoughts recur. In an event in the early history of Rome, in the speech of Camillus, in which he calls upon the people to rebuild the city, destroyed by the Gauls (5, 51 f.), the historian expressed as in a mirror the emotions that were moving him and his age. Just as in Horace the reverence and the neglect of the gods are contrasted as the decisive factors. It was through the *negligentia divini cultus* (5, 51, 4) that the disaster had then fallen upon Rome. It was the *religio*, on the other hand, the elaborate 'attention' to the gods and to the warnings that they impart, the exact observation of the honours that they demand²³—it was this that had in the past worked for good and that would continue so to work.²⁴

It is obvious that the restoration of the temples could only represent one side of the new interest that was expressing itself for the ancestral religion. Along with it goes the resumption of obsolete rites and ceremonies; this began with the solemn declaration of war in the old fashion, which Octavian undertook as *fetial* against Cleopatra in the year 32 B.C. A special importance was claimed by the reform

of the priesthoods; not only were completely forgotten societies, such as those of the Titii or the Arval Brethren, recalled to life, but Augustus with his closest friends entered into them. In this way he set an example for the senatorial nobility, which now remembered its former importance as bearer of the state-cult and religion of Rome and resumed the tradition that had been interrupted by the civil wars; this was to be of special significance for the future. The Emperor was concerned to give the necessary basis in public law to this revival by admitting, beside the senators, only the knights to places in the priesthoods; the rest of the citizen body remained excluded.²⁵

When Augustus finally, in the year 12 B.C., reached the office of *pontifex maximus* and thus connected it for ever with the Empire, his endeavours were extended anew to the colleges, that were now set immediately under his control. He sought to overcome the aversion of the noble families to making their daughters Vestals by increasing the honours accorded to them and, further, by the observation that he himself, had any of his granddaughters been of the prescribed age, would not have hesitated to set the example (Suetonius, *Aug.* 31, 3). Even the difficult task of finding an incumbent for the post of *flamen Dialis*, that had been unoccupied for seventy-five years, was solved by a mitigation of the sacral obligations to which that office was subject.

Beside this pronounced restoration of old forms, we meet occasionally with an institution which avails itself of the old to fulfil new purposes, arising out of the special position of the Principate. This is what corresponds on the Roman side to the return to the classical creations of Greek religion. Just as the temple of Apollo on the Palatine had been built *in solo privato* and thus linked to the imperial palace, so now, after the adoption of the office of *pontifex maximus* by Augustus, there was dedicated a new shrine to Vesta on the same spot. It took its place beside the venerable temple of the goddess on the forum, to which as to hardly another site was attached the memory of the ancient religion of Rome. The idea of monarchy, that had played its part, among other motives, in the new establishment of the Greek cult, now expresses itself on the Roman side. In the close connexion

with Apollo and Vesta was expressed the fact that the imperial house had become a centre of the whole cult of the city of Rome. This is once again shown in pictorial form on the base of Sorrento, for there appear on it not only Apollo of the Palatine, but also the new imperial Vesta.²⁰

Our last remarks have brought us to a point where the reform of Augustus ceases to be a mere turning back to a past world, a reawakening of its religious values. The Principate in its very nature was something that had not been there before; if it now sought and found expression in the religion of the state, the institutions thus created were bound to represent an innovation on what had been.

This, however, does not mean to say that a break with the past was at once involved. Such an attitude stands in direct contrast to the Roman nature, of which it is definitely characteristic, that it can only advance to new and decisive formulation and creation on the basis of the old. Just as the Principate itself only developed its special nature from the use of existent forms and visibly laid stress on a continuity of this kind, so were even the new creations of Augustus in the state-cult no more than a continuation of what was already present in Roman belief.

While those new creations of the Emperor were in some measure directed to raise the glory of the Julian house and with it the greatness of the deified father by adoption of Augustus, a point of contact was offered in the old religion, and in general in the old conceptions, by the idea of the family (*gens*). It appears everywhere in Roman life as a very living and effective force; Hegel has wanted to see in it one of the vital foundations. The divine worship of ancestors, the authoritative force of all that they have done and determined, the conception of their existence as a challenge and a protection for their descendants, meets us at more than one point. How vividly the age of Augustus was still aware of such things may be illustrated by a single example. When Germanicus, in his last German campaign, leads his fleet into the canal that bore the name of his father, at the moment when he is hoping to complete the work of the dead, he cries out to him as mighty helper in the undertaking that lay before him: *precatus . . . Drusum patrem ut se*

cadem ausum libens placatusque exemplo ac memoria consiliorum atque operum iuvaret (Tacitus, *Ann.* 2, 8).

It was in this sphere, as we have observed, that Augustus was bound to find his point of departure. To correspond to the unique position of the imperial house, comparable to nothing that had gone before it, all the suggestions supplied by the private practice of cults were raised to the grand scale and made obligatory on the whole community. From this special cult of the reigning house, that not only went back to Venus as divine ancestress, but also could recently number a god among her descendants, was bound to arise a tendency for it to take its place with equal rights beside the places of worship of the former gods, full as they were of the memories of the Republican age, and even to put them in the shade.

The beginning of these efforts was marked by the dedication of the *aedes divi Iulii* on the old forum (29 B.C.) and the completion of a new forum, which had been begun by Caesar himself and which was now named the Forum Julium.²⁷ But it was not till the year 2 B.C. that the completion of the Forum Augustum marked the climax of the innovations that aimed at the divine glorification of Augustus's own house. Not only in its architectural form did it mark an epoch,²⁸ but even more by the place that it took within the cult of the state. For whereas, in the first cases, the great Caesar, like the ancestress of the Julian line, worshipped on the forum as Venus Genetrix, took his place with equal privilege beside the older gods, just as the forum itself took its place beside the former Republican market-place, so the last-named foundation no longer confines itself to aiming at equality of rights with the shrines already in existence. For the first time special privileges were deliberately allotted to the new creation. This endeavour, which had already found expression, after the adoption of the office of *pontifex maximus*, in Augustus's transference of the Sibylline prophecies from the Capitol to the temple of Apollo on the Palatine, or in the foundation of a new imperial shrine of Vesta, now undergoes a very wide increase in scope.

The principle of the change is important and requires closer study. It has its analogy in the strictly political

sphere. Whilst the Principate in its beginnings was anxiously careful to appear as the continuation and fulfilment of the old constitution and to avoid every apparent break with the past, from the decisive year 23 B.C.²⁹ this connexion with the inherited forms of state is no longer preserved in the former measure. In both cases the form of monarchy, as time goes on, shows itself in increasingly unveiled form. Thus, the new temple of Mars, which was begun soon after that year, was not only built once again *in solo privato*, but Augustus equipped this place, that was linked to all the memories of the Julian house, with a number of privileges which left far behind all that had gone before it. The special position of this temple was the more important in the sequel, as all those privileges had in the old time been peculiar to the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol.³⁰ Now they were taken from it and transferred to the new shrine which so visibly incorporated the Principate in itself.

The immediate and close connexion of new foundations with the imperial house and the deliberate emphasizing of such cults as were related to the Julian *gens* gives us occasion to consider one final point. The more that the imperial interest comes to the fore in the cult of the state, the more must we wish to know what position the *princeps* had allotted to himself in the framework of his religious innovations.

3. The question has recently been attacked in an essay by O. Immisch.³¹ For him Octavian and Antony embody in themselves the decisive contrasts in the field of religion as of politics. The one, devoted to the cult of Dionysos and its already Orientalized form, allows himself to be celebrated in loud triumphal processions as the risen lord and god of the inhabited world, whilst the measured and dignified nature of the other chose the opposite pole in the divine world; in this moment of the world's history Apollo confronts Dionysos. And to suit the tendency to self-command, clarity and fine aloofness, no apotheosis of the rulers is achieved here. Apollo is protector of the *princeps*; his ideal is that of Apollo, but in person he must not be the god.³²

That this contrast implies the realization of something of importance need hardly be emphasized. The connexion

with what we said at starting about the aversion of Augustus to Oriental deities and his preference for Apollo will easily be established. Into the whole range of questions, which Immisch has touched on in connexion with his main thesis, we cannot here enter; ⁸³ one of the most important, that of the religious meaning of the age of Augustus, will come up for discussion in the next chapter. Here we will only try to answer the question, how did the Emperor himself and his immediate friends wish his relationship to Apollo to be understood? The attempt cannot be made without previous discussion of the far more comprehensive problem, of whether Augustus really disdained any kind of divine rank for his own person.

Put in this way, the question has, of course, no meaning except for Rome and its state-cult. For the provinces the answer is, that the Emperor there accepted the offer of divine honours, whether for himself alone or in connexion with the goddess Roma, of whom we have already had something to say. From now on temples of Augustus (or of *Σεβαστός Καῖσαρ*) appear not only in the provinces, but also in the communities of Italy. The divine worship of the Emperor, then, was introduced in all parts of the Empire, and the capital alone made an exception. Here, in the capital, was established the strict principle, ⁸⁴ strict in men's minds even if it was occasionally infringed later (Dio Cassius 51, 20, 8), that only the dead ruler could become a god in the state-cult. The direct model was supplied by the consecration of Caesar, who had been adopted among the gods of the state by a decree of the senate and people in the year 42 B.C. and had received a temple on the forum thirteen years later. But whereas the dictator had experienced divine honours in his own person even while on earth, ⁸⁵ the Emperor rejected like honours for himself in his lifetime, and contented himself with the title of *Divi filius*.

We can now put our question in a more precise form; did this rule imply that each and every kind of divine quality was denied to the living Emperor? Was it really the case that on one side stood the dead rulers as *Divi*, whilst the living Emperor remained man and never more than man?

A distinction there certainly is. Roman thought never

admitted the deification of a living man. On the other hand, not only can the dead Emperor become *Divus*, but every dead man at the moment of his decease joins the ranks of the *di manes*, about whose character the description of them as 'gods' leaves no doubt. Despite many differences in detail, the analogy of the two conceptions is unmistakable. And yet, here as elsewhere, the limits were less strictly observed than our systematic inquiry might be disposed to allow.³⁶

What lifted Augustus at once above the human sphere was the universal consciousness of his unique historical greatness. The poets, Virgil and Horace, too, were the first to see the divine element in the figure of the ruler and praise it in enthusiastic terms. What is implied in this first disclosure of the divine character to the poets will have to be considered later. Here we are only interested in their utterances, so far as they found an echo in the state-cult. They had at least given a hint, suggested a direction. It was inevitable that the official view should tread similar paths.

The very title of *Divi filius* involved a special right, which raised its possessor above other men.³⁷ Virgil reflects this peculiarity in pictorial form, when Augustus on the shield of Aeneas (*Aen.* 8, 680 f.) appears with the star of *Divus Iulius* above his head and enveloped in a fiery glory. But even within the cult of the state, the Emperor took up a special position. However decidedly he removed from himself every trace of veneration that might have led to his enrolment among the gods of the state, he by no means disdained divine honours. We need only quote a few examples, without attempting to exhaust the list.

To this context belong the facts, that as early as the year 29 his name was enrolled in the hymn of the Salii (Dio Cassius 51, 20, 1; cp. *Mon. Anc.* 2, 21,³⁸ 5, 17 gr.), and that the day on which he entered the city was celebrated with sacrifices and declared to be a day of festival. The same is true of the right to wear the wreath of the triumpher at all public ceremonies (Dio Cassius, loc. cit. 2). And just as that day of festival found its completion in the celebration of the return of Augustus from the East (19 B.C.) and the erection of the *ara Fortunae Reducis*, so too was the honour

of the wreath completed by the permission to wear it and the costume of the triumpher (*ἐσθῆς νικητηγία*: Dio Cassius, 53, 26, 5) on the first day of every year. Both were parts of that garb which made the triumpher on his solemn procession to the Capitol appear as the image of Jupiter Optimus Maximus.³⁹ This attribute of the god himself, which the Republic had only allowed to its chief magistrate in the one supreme and most solemn moment, was allotted to the Emperor as a permanent right.

In this context sufficient attention does not seem to have been given to the dedication of the *ara Pacis Augustae* on the Field of Mars. On his return from Spain and Gaul in the year 13 B.C. Augustus declined the altar intended for him in person in the senate-house,⁴⁰ but did accept another altar assigned to the goddess of peace. It is the shrine, erected four years later, to which the reliefs that survive in many fragments belong; they are the masterpiece of Augustan art. But even better than these pictures on the monument does the last Ode of Horace (c. 4, 15) give us an idea of the thoughts and conceptions that were connected with this foundation. Vital was the connexion with Augustus himself. It finds expression in the very name, that can only mean that peace proceeds from the Emperor himself.⁴¹ In the Ode of Horace this finds its confirmation; but, more than that, when at the close, in the circle of the family and under cover of the time-honoured forms (*rite deos prius adprecati*: 28), the praise of the heroes is sung, who have founded the greatness of Rome, among the *progenies Veneris* we may think not only of Aeneas, but also of his imperial descendants.⁴² Just as the divine worship of the peace that proceeds from the Emperor casts on him a reflection of divinity, so does the connexion with the great men of the past of Rome bring him into the neighbourhood of the gods, especially if we may give a general meaning, beyond its special occasion, to a remark that goes back to Augustus himself,—*proximum a dis immortalibus honorem memoriae ducum praestitit, qui imperium p. R. ex minimo maximum reddidissent* (Suetonius, *Aug.* 81, 5).⁴³ So, in this case, despite the refusal of direct divine honours, a special position is reserved to the *princeps*, which, without directly

expressing it, hints at a closer relationship to the world of the divine.

The worship of the imperial *genius* must also be taken into account. Once again its origins go far back in history. As early as the year 29 a decree of the senate prescribed a libation of wine to that deity at all public and private meals (Dio Cassius 51, 19, 7; cp. Horace, c. 4, 5, 81 f.; Petronius 60). This regulation was supplemented by the association in cult of the *genius Augusti* with the worship of the *Lares* at the Compita, which received its final form in the year 7 B.C.⁴⁴ This worship of the imperial *genius* once again goes back to an ancient Roman conception; for every Roman recognized in his own *genius* not only his personal companion and the begetter of his body, but the god as well.⁴⁵ But when the *genius* of Augustus was removed from this throng of private *genii* and its worship was made obligatory on all, the special position of the Emperor, raised above the ordinary human sphere, once again found expression.

Of decisive importance remains the name Augustus itself, which Octavian accepted in the year 27 on the proposition of Munatius Plancus. Dio Cassius 53, 16, 8, interprets it thus: *Αὔγουστος ὡς καὶ πλεῖόν τι ἢ κατὰ ἀνθρώπους ὢν ἐπεκλήθη*, and observes *πάντα γὰρ τὰ ἐντιμώτατα καὶ τὰ ἱερώτατα αὔγουστα προσαγορεύεται*. The tradition of the word, that meets us for the first time in the *augustum augurium* of Ennius (*Ann.* 502 V., cp. 77 f.), always points to the sacral sphere; it is often associated with *sanctus* and *religiosus*.⁴⁶ The proper meaning suggests that something is meant that goes beyond the human realm and draws near to the divine, although the superhuman element is not definitely described as divine; this, even if implied, is left vague, as far as direct expression in language is concerned.

In Ovid, *Met.* 6, 72 f., for example, Pallas represents on her web the twelve gods, sitting in *augusta gravitate* on their lofty thrones. This means to say that they were indeed human in form, but that by that quality they were lifted above the merely human. In similar style Evander remarks (*Livy* 1, 7, 9,) in the stranger *habitum formamque . . . aliquantum ampliore[m] augustiore[m]que humana*, and thus recognizes in him Hercules. The word can even be used of a

ghostly apparation (Livy 8, 6, 9; 9, 10); and Hercules begins, at the moment of his ascent to heaven, *maior . . . videri . . . et augusta fieri gravitate verendus* (Ovid, *Met.* 9, 269 f.). Dio Cassius, then, in his interpretation, has hit the mark. We must admit that in the description as Augustus an actual elevation above the human sphere is expressed, the unspoken presence of that which, in more positive style, Vitruvius, in his dedication of his work, comprehends in the solemn address; *Divina tua mens et numen, imperator Caesar*, or in what found expression in the state-cult of Rome even in the lifetime of the Emperor in the sacrifice for the *numen Augusti*.⁴⁷

One further case will at once make this clear. The story is told in Suetonius, *Aug.* 94, 5 f., of how Octavius, the father of the future ruler, had the greatness of his son prophesied to him by the Thracian oracle of Dionysos. In the following night he saw in a dream *filium mortali specie ampliore*, decked with the symbols of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. In these words is revealed that very peculiarity that forms the content of the word Augustus. Here again is the connexion with the external appearance of the Capitoline god, which has met us already in the wearing of the triumphal garb and of the wreath of victory and has been interpreted as a point of contact with the divine sphere. In the narrative of Suetonius the two have blended into one picture—a proof that the underlying conception is everywhere a fixed and consistent one.

If we set out from this result, we are able to give an interpretation of the relation of the Emperor to other deities as well, and, in particular, to Apollo, different from any that has hitherto been given. In the case of Caesar, men did not shrink from calling him Jupiter Julius outright (Dio Cassius 44, 6, 4); but with Augustus in this case we may expect a more cautious form of expression. The contact with the divine was by no means denied in this case too, but in the cult of the state itself a direct identification of the living Emperor with the god was not achieved. At this point our study has need to go back some way up-stream. Beginning with a case that at first appears quite distinct, it will yet end by winding its way to the conclusion at which we have already hinted.

In the second Ode of his First Book, Horace speaks of Mercury as having descended to earth and having entered into the person of Octavian. The precise form of words gives us to understand that the god has laid aside his heavenly form and has taken instead the appearance and features of the young ruler. Although belonging in his origin to the heavenly sphere, Mercury allows himself to be identified with the avenger of Cæsar, sojourning on earth (41 f.).⁴⁸ From what source the poet got this idea need not be asked here; ⁴⁹ enough that it does not appear in Horace alone, but finds its counterpart in a monument of private cult.

The master of the altar of Bologna has given pictorial expression to a similar thought. Here Rome appears, hastening ahead of a Mercury who follows her. He himself, bearing in his right hand the caduceus, in his left the purse, unmistakably wears the features of the Emperor.⁵⁰ The same device has been employed by the artist of a cameo of like date. There, too, appears the god, with the staff of the herald at his side, again as the idealized picture of the Emperor.⁵¹ The comparison with the words of Horace, that forces itself on us, yields in one point at least what we may call a literal agreement.⁵² In both cases the earthly appearance of the god, the form in which he manifests himself visibly to his worshippers, is identical with the outward likeness of the ruler. In this, following Roma, the god brings to human-kind blessing and success.

The identification of Octavian with Mercury, it is true, was destined to remain an isolated phenomenon. Wherever it appears,⁵³ it belongs to the practice of private cult. Into the religion of the state it never found admittance. Yet even for that cult it has a certain significance, inasmuch as it opens the way to a more correct view of another case than was possible before. And here we come back to the question which formed our starting-point—the relation of the Emperor to Apollo.

According to a note of Ps.-Acro on Horace, *Ep.* 1, 3, 17, Augustus actually set up a statue of himself in the library of the temple on the Palatine, *habitu ac statu Apollinis*. To reject this note offhand is impossible in view of the two types of Mercury just described. Just as the image of

Mercury appeared there, so there appears here a statue of the type of Apollo with the features of the portrait of the Emperor. But the underlying conception is distinct in one point at least: the god has not descended to earth and taken the form of the ruler, but the ruler, on the contrary, has been deliberately raised above humanity and brought near to the divine sphere. This apparently trivial difference has nevertheless some importance; for, in this second case, a direct identification of the ruler with Apollo is avoided. This fits in perfectly with that picture of the position of Augustus that we have sketched; the public statue, erected by Augustus himself, is distinguished from the private dedication by an emphatic reticence.

A second notice concerns us here. Servius, too (*Ecl.* 4, 10), knows of a statue of Augustus *cum Apollinis cunctis insignibus*—whether he means the one just mentioned or another is not clear. In any case the mention of the divine insignia reminds us of the story that we quoted from Suetonius, where there appears to Octavius in a dream the form of his son, *cum fulmine et sceptro exuvisque Iovis Optimi Maximi ac radiata corona, super laureatum currum, bis senis equis candore eximio trahentibus* (*Aug.* 94, 6). We go on to think of all those institutions of which we have spoken in which this dream was realized—the triumphal robe and the wreath, which the Emperor was permitted to wear. As parts of the costume of the triumpher they belong at the same time to Jupiter of the Capitol. Here again, then, Augustus appears with the symbols of a god.

In spite of such agreement there is one difference that should not be forgotten. The significance of the appearance in public in triumphal costume and that of the statue of Augustus in the pose of Apollo are not the same. In the one case we have an institution of the cult of the state, which has its roots in the ancient ordering of the triumph; in the other, the claims of the Emperor are merely worked out in the sphere of artistic creation. But a certain claim was involved, as is proved by the fact that Augustus himself ordered the setting up of the statue in the Palatine library. It was his own wish, we may fairly assume, to be seen in such an Apollo-like form. An occurrence out of the early

career of Octavian, which has usually been disposed of as a mere youthful folly, now assumes a new light.

We refer to the *cena δωδεκάθεος* of the year 40,⁵⁴ at which Octavian himself appeared in the rôle of Apollo. We only know of this performance from Suetonius (*Aug.* 70, 1-2), whose sources in the main are the polemic of Antony and a city satire, which branded this imitation of the *lectisternium* of the twelve gods as frivolous licence. That this hostile attitude was partly determined by a famine, that reigned at the time in the city, is expressly told us. This means, however, that the polemic can hardly give fair evidence for the idea which Octavian himself wished to express in this performance. That a mere frivolity was necessarily intended is by no means proved; there is certainly a possibility that this was the first occasion on which the element of Apollo in Octavian found expression as a pose and a claim. It is probable that a direct identification with the god was intended; but however we decide that question, the opposition of public opinion in Rome drove Octavian at once to greater restraint. After this, it was only in plastic form that expression was given to that which Octavian had not shrunk from expressing in his own person.

The relation of the exact opposite of Octavian, of Antony, to Dionysos, ὃ μάλιστα συνεξομοίων καὶ συνοικειῶν ἑαυτὸν διέτελεσεν (*Plutarch, Ant.* 75),⁵⁵ came very close at first in one point to Augustus's endeavours. More we must not say, for after that imitation of the *lectisternium* we may fairly speak of a deepening and purification of the idea of Apollo in the experience of Augustus. Despite his lively consciousness of his own Apollo-like nature, he bowed to the Roman view, which refused the direct apotheosis of a living man. In so doing, Augustus was certainly true in a deeper sense than before to the real nature of Apollo himself, who expressed better than any other the warning to mankind to regard moderation and to remember its frailty. But the sense of inner unity with Apollo and all that belongs to him survived this renunciation in the mind of the Emperor himself—and of others, too. The succeeding age grasped what he thought he might claim for himself and sanctioned his unity of form with the god.

On the altar of Carthage, which was erected for the *gens Augusta*, in the seated figure of Apollo of one side-relief has been recognized the statue of the temple of Augustus, begun by Tiberius and completed by Caligula. As such it must have borne the features of the Emperor himself,⁵⁶ and here again is expressed the connexion that we have already observed. Now, however, this conception has passed all earlier bounds and has become regular for the cult of the state. Its effects are seen in another direction as well. Only if the connexion of form with Apollo was felt in the person of Augustus can we understand that strange interpretation of a famous verse of Virgil, that appears in the commentary of Servius. It was thought justifiable to apply the prophecy of blessing:

Casta fave Lucina, tuus iam regnat Apollo,

to Augustus and his sister; *quidam . . . Octaviam sororem Augusti significari adfirmat ipsumque Augustum Apollinem* (on v. 10). From this it was but a step to the assertion that Apollo himself had visited the mother of Octavian and that the Emperor was thus the son of the god. The source of Suetonius already knew this legend in all its essential features (*Aug.* 94, 4), even if it underwent further development later (*Dio Cassius*, 45, 1, 2).⁵⁷

Chapter IV

THE RELIGION OF THE AGE OF AUGUSTUS

THE question is always being raised whether it is proper to speak of a religion of the age of Augustus, at least of one that deserves the name in the strict and proper sense and that derives its powers from something more than political motives. As in the forms of the state, so too in the reorganization of religion and cult, scholars have thought that they could recognize a mere creation of the Emperor himself. Dictated by the will of the Emperor not merely to restore the state, but to build it up in such a way that the person of the 'princeps' should be the real centre of support for its structure, that order seemed to have taken shape entirely under the influence of expediency and calculation. Of a true and deep relation to religion, in the Emperor at least, there need, it was thought, be no question.

It might appear as a confirmation of this view that the age itself seemed incapable of an original religious movement. The last years of the Republic had set the seal on the recoil from the gods of tradition. The philosophy of Epicurus, which banished them to a blissful middle kingdom, not to be reached by any human appeal, could at the beginning of this age count the best Romans among its adherents. Hence it seemed impossible to credit the following age with a belief of the old kind. Whatever was offered in the way of outward glories, whether solemn ceremonies of cult, grand new buildings or restoration of the old, could only be designed to work externally on the great masses of the people. For the others, the philosophic speculations about the nature and activities of the gods—above all, the theology of the Stoa—supplied a practical means of disposing of the inherited conceptions.

Such is the view that still finds supporters to-day, that

may even, if we disregard a few exceptions,¹ rank as orthodox. Characteristic of it is its predominantly negative attitude to its subject, whether that be Augustus himself or his age. If we are to attempt an appraisal fundamentally different from this in kind, we must begin with the total religious content of the age. The great personality who has given it his name and imprint will only come within our survey later.

1. If once we raise the question, how the general view of the Augustan religion that we have sketched was reached, we shall feel the need to extend our inquiry to the general assumptions that underlie that verdict. Such assumptions, especially as they usually appear without warning, are more important than they at first seem. In this case one is tempted to regard them as the very foundation on which the reigning verdict is based. This is seen clearly the moment that we look away from the details and extricate the general view that underlies them.

It seems to me that what has determined research up to now is the fact that it pictures historical time, like physical time, as a uniform continuum. The development that takes place in it from one historical event to another must therefore follow in a movement that advances step by step. It is a quantitative process; one stage of development passes over into another by a gradual increase or decrease, by an addition or a subtraction. The differences of quality that are actually present are, whether consciously or unconsciously, so completely obliterated that one might almost suppose that all historical change is at bottom nothing but the quantitative differentiation of a uniform material. But that, it was supposed, was the only way in which historical development as such could become intelligible. By this gradual advance, determined by laws, the coming of new stages would at first be hidden from the general consciousness and the disturbance that is involved in all change would thus be softened. Thus it was possible, without any too violent interference with the former stock of ideas, for something new to prepare its way, gain admittance and then advance to triumph.

The possibility of such an interpretation has been sought

in vain in the appearance of the epoch of Augustus and of its new attitude to religion. The epoch and its religion are not something that simply occurred, something that ripened to full growth; their appearance is linked in time with the appearance of the ruler; the new element is there overnight. First, we find a heyday of the teachings of Epicurus, an elegant scepticism or, at best, a philosophic interpretation of the popular belief—and, a few years later, a complete change of heart—what had before been scorned not only taken seriously, but almost recognized as the meaning of human existence. Here the assumption seemed to impose itself on us, that this could not be anything normal, any growth in the field of religion proper, but that it must be an assumed attitude, the motives of which must be sought elsewhere, in some influence exerted from outside.

And yet, a view that appeals to the uniformity and continuity of historical time and to the conception of development that is bound up with it is by no means the only possible one, nor is it particularly convincing or fruitful. We should rather consider whether historical time cannot be conceived of as something discontinuous and disparate. We should then have to distinguish between times that in a historical sense are full of importance and times that are empty of it, times that are full of character and times that are not; there would be no gradual passage from one to the other, but a manifest cessation and recommencement. It has been observed that nature allows herself rhythmical pauses for breath between her creations of master-spirits; so, too, may history be conceived as a rhythmic movement, an advance in stages and epochs. Times of rest and relaxation, even times in which a backward movement towards the past may be detected, alternate with others in which forces of propulsion burst out with eruptive power and accomplish the creation of a new world in one pregnant and fruitful moment. But the achievement of such a creation is no phenomenon to be grasped by measurement or any process of reason, but as act only, as single and unique occurrence, beyond all calculation.

It was in such a form that the age of Augustus saw itself. It must have conceived of its religious attitude, just as it

conceived of its attitude to the state and to art, as a deliberate turning, an entirely new beginning. In proof of this, we need only call to mind the thought of the coming of a new age of bliss, which won so central a place in the Augustan religion; in the song of the poet as well as in public ceremonies was the advent of the new age announced. What was accomplished here on the grand scale is also reflected in the life of individuals.

For the young Virgil we must assume some such turning-point, not very long after that resolve of his that seemed to him of such decisive importance, to give up poetry together with the school of rhetoric and to take refuge in the wisdom of the great Siron. Only a few years later, and in the bucolic poetry, we find quite another picture. In the First Eclogue we meet with the glorification of Octavian as a god on earth; that implies a violent recoil from the teaching of Epicurus.

What took place in the interval may be grasped to some extent in its importance, but how it occurred may well be beyond our power to say. Horace, with his greater communicativeness and his way of raising personal experience to universal validity, has treasured up one decisive event of his own life (c. 1, 84). In a mighty natural phenomenon, in a thunderclap out of a clear sky, the divine working became manifest to him in all its greatness. The overwhelming suddenness of the experience enabled him to renounce the errors of Epicurean wisdom; from henceforth he will return to the beliefs of long ago.¹ In a symbolical event is here expressed how completely fundamental the recoil from his former ways was felt to be; with what decision, what suddenness, the mind of an individual turned towards an experience which was felt to be new.

In yet another direction must we undertake the test that we demanded at the beginning of our discussion. We have just observed how Horace in that poem contrasted his new recognition of the divine *numen* with the philosophic 'wisdom' of other years; and with that we have said what really matters. Among the general assumptions that have hitherto determined the verdict on the Augustan religion, we must name before all others the rôle assigned to philosophy, or rather to what was called philosophic enlightenment. Not

only was it credited with a destructive and dissolving effect on the masses of the population ; with the educated classes, in particular, it was supposed to have blocked any immediate and, so to say, naïve approach to religion. But against this view, too, certain doubts must be raised.

Was it really the case that, while some could only make themselves ready for a fresh worship of the gods by way of interpretation through speculative philosophy, others hung in old and unbroken simplicity on the inherited beliefs ? Let us admit the real facts of the case ; the division thus drawn between a cultured upper class and the great mass of the people and the uneducated³ ought long since to have aroused suspicion, just because it seemed so obvious, so removed from any doubt. We know this contrast well enough from the problems of our modern culture ; but that does not give us the right to find it again without discussion in ancient times. Here again a prejudice seems to have been applied to our subject, without any question of its justification having been raised. We ought to begin by asking whether philosophy really possessed such an importance as has so gaily been assigned to it. We must question whether its rôle in Rome was such that it could possibly produce a deep cleavage in the nation.

If we disregard the unique Lucretius (who appears with good cause in our tradition as the lonely thinker), philosophy never appeared in Rome as philosophy pure and simple. The passion for metaphysics is absolutely foreign to the Roman, and it was only the connexion with practical wisdom that could procure any more general acceptance for philosophic doctrines.⁴ Remarkable, too, is the absence of a philosophic terminology, announcing itself as such ; the Scholastics had to create one a millennium later out of their own resources. Whatever thoughts were expressed, however original or far-fetched they were, they were bound in Rome to adapt themselves to the rules and vocabulary of the literary language ; it is but seldom that a new form is admitted, and only then when it has been acknowledged and excused as such. It is not the esoteric, but the generally intelligible, that is expected of philosophic narrative. In this respect, in their linguistic dress, the philosophic writings of Cicero

will probably remain unmatched, however we may judge them in other respects.

The place of philosophy, then, is quite a different one from what at first appeared. Far from working towards a cleavage of the nation as a whole, it has rather the tendency to make itself more and more generally accessible. In the last years of the Republic it was on the high road towards communicating itself to the broad masses of the population. The preacher of Stoic or Cynic wisdom, who paraded the streets with his long beard and shabby cloak and peddled his doctrines to the people, has been immortalized in the Satires of Horace. That Satire itself has not disdained to take over the neat examples and anecdotes, the plays on words and apophthegms of this popular wisdom, in order to convert them, when shaped and purified by art, into an integral part of its own diction.

And yet the age of Augustus was very far from having recourse to philosophy and making use of it as a means of introducing a new relationship to religion.⁶ The Stoic element that was supposed to exist in the *Aeneid* has not stood the test of experience as well as was hoped. The idea of the working of *fatum*, in particular, is not based on philosophical doctrine, but implies, as has recently been emphasized, a specifically Roman view of time and history.⁶ With the fall of this main argument much else becomes doubtful, to which too much importance had perhaps been attributed on the basis of that very view. However many details may be recorded of the personal reverence that Augustus paid to his Stoic teacher, Areios Didymos, they do not entitle us, without further consideration, to assume a Stoic colour in the attitude of the Emperor to the gods. Such general reflections, as that we must not credit Augustus with a 'simple belief' in a Mars or an Apollo, have no special significance. For, apart from the fact that such supposed simplicity lies more in the thought of the modern critic than in the nature of the ancient god, the plain facts speak another language.

As regards the innermost personal relation of Augustus to the divine, we may call to mind those extraordinary details that are preserved in the biography of Suetonius (c. 90-2). Here it is a true Roman who meets us, a Roman who is never

weary of chronicling the expressions of the *numen*, who is disturbed by signs in the heavens, who observes dreams and other omens with the most painful care.' However strange for our modern feeling the form that these things take, there is expressed in them a genuine *religio*, which the Roman could always distinguish from mere superstition.

This *religio* it was, and not Stoic philosophy, that dictated in general the decisive actions of the Emperor. . And if *pietas* towards gods and men ⁹ is the hall-mark of Aeneas, that too is a quality that was felt to be characteristic of Augustus himself. It is one of the virtues which the senate and people recorded on a golden shield that they presented to the Emperor. In *pietas* and *religio* the religious attitude, the ideals of the past of Rome, are consciously resumed and renewed, and the same is true of the belief in the gods themselves. There is not a word to suggest that any kind of speculative interpretation was applied to the Palatine Apollo or his sister or to the deities of the Capitol. Cult and poetry alike take them unreservedly for what they are—divine powers, figures of the religious domain and of no other.

In contrast to the declining Republic, men are now united on this point. It is safe in general to assert that in the Augustan epoch the importance of professional philosophizing—not, be it observed, of the philosophic attitude in itself—falls into the background. It has this in common with another age that in many other respects is closely akin to it, the prime of the Renaissance in Italy. Just as the revival of Platonism or the appearance of a Bruno and a Cardano does not coincide with the 'golden age' proper, so too the Augustan epoch has nothing to show comparable to the philosophic works of the preceding decades or even to a Seneca. We must search for that in another place. If any one asks where final expression has been found for all that the full Renaissance had to say about itself and its relation to God and to the world, he may be referred once for all to the frescoes of the Sistine Chapel or to the Stances. Pictorial was the form that it took; and the Augustan age likewise had recourse to this clearest and most palpable of expressions. In works of art, once again, its relation to religion has found

its expression. It is the plastic art, the relief, above all, that gained a fresh importance in this age.

Of the sacred art of Italy, that had once reached so rich a development and that had created works of significance for Rome itself, there were towards the close of the third century at best a few late survivors in existence. The taste of the age, favoured by the mass import of stolen goods, turned with decision to Greek plastic art, to the contemporary in preference to all others. Its overwhelming reputation forbade any faint stirrings of life that might show themselves in the creative art of the Greeks of Italy to advance beyond a purely local validity, not to speak of their reaching any solution of monumental tasks. It is only towards the close of the Republic that a plastic art begins to develop that could deserve the name of a Roman art.

The last phase of Hellenism had come to the point of abandoning the piled masses and bold contours of a style of passionate movement and turning again to the quiet and measured forms that were at hand in the works of the classical age. In Rome, too, the new style finds admittance. The so-called altar of Domitius Ahenobarbus, the frescoes of the Hall of the Mysteries in the Villa Itern at Pompeii, show how this style expresses itself in the material of religion. The parallel to such tendencies in literature is obvious and has already been drawn.⁹

In many scenes of the altar of Domitius the beginnings of a new and specifically Roman art had already shown themselves. At this point the age of Augustus sets in with its own special endeavours. In contrast to pure classicism on the Greek side, it will not be satisfied with a mere return to the works of the finest period, but from its new sense of style it advances towards the representation of subjects specifically Roman. Scenes from the past of Rome, especially from Roman legend, alternate on the monuments with the glorification of a brilliant present. For the first time there was created in Rome a style of public representation that was really representative and had its eyes directed to great tasks. It celebrates not only the fame of the imperial house, but, at least as fully, the gods, who hold their protecting hand over the state and its rulers. In the relief of Tellus on the

Ara Pacis the idea of the kindly and beneficent earth-mother has been raised from its original bondage to nature into the ideal world of artistic expression. If in this case it is chiefly a happy richness and charm that blends with the magic of poetic sentiment, there are other cases where there is revealed a measure and dignity that had not been seen since the classical period, both in the solemn processions and other ceremonies and in the pictures of the heroic age of early Rome.

But beside art and far beyond it, poetry it was in which the attitude of this age to religion created its true form of expression. Our attention must now be directed to the work of those two great men who determined the spiritual state of the Rome of their day, Horace and Virgil. We have already had occasion to refer to their poetry as a document of personal destiny and personal relation to divine things. But it goes far beyond this narrow sphere in its range of importance. We may affirm that without the creations of the Augustan poets a conception of the religion of the epoch would be impossible.

The starting-point for any discussion of the subject is thus fixed for us to-day. But whilst a firm foundation at last seems to be offered to us, new questions and doubts at once begin to reveal themselves.

2. The first doubt depends on the character of this poetry itself. The very fact that the religious attitude of the whole age could find expression in it seemed to involve a serious objection to the genuineness and originality of that attitude.

It used to be easy for us to brand with the charge of unnaturalness the over-ripe, the too deliberately grandiose diction of the Augustan works of poetry, because of their very ripeness and self-consciousness. To these creations seemed to cling the character of the 'literary', of the derivative and secondary. In view of the traditional reputation of all original work, this seemed to amount to a condemnation, and from this direction there seemed to be no way leading to a living appreciation of them.

A second doubt, closely connected with the first, was concerned less with the rôle of the poems than with that of the poets themselves. The masters of Augustan art, whether

it be the reliefs of the altar of Peace or the monumental structure of the Forum of Augustus, must remain without names for us. But the odes of Horace or the poems of Virgil influence us not only as accomplished creations, but also as the characteristic works of a great individual. It is the poet, then, who for this age represents the bearer and announcer of the divine. The central position of poetry leads of necessity to a situation quite unique in history—the rôle of leadership for the poet himself. But this is the very fact that will not fit in so readily into the traditional circle of ideas.

There has been an extensive literature concerned with religion and economics and religion and sociology which has tried to establish certain main types of religious movement. The magician, the priest or the king appear as bearers of a special grace; in the Oriental religions the prophet meets us as the decisive factor. Nothing comparable to this could be observed in the Augustan age, and that seemed to give a reason for an attitude of rejection. A religion, for which the poet was representative and which saw its essence expressed in poetic form, seemed to have no place in the systems hitherto in vogue.¹⁰

And yet it should be time to ask wherein the real fault lay—in the peculiar nature of the Augustan religion or, maybe, in the failure of those systems to embrace all possible cases. The religion of Homer, too, is a religion of the poet, he is leader and spokesman in it; it is remarkable that there, too, a similar verdict used to be considered justifiable. But, be that as it may, this tentative position does not allow us to dispense with a thorough test of the objections that we have just urged. They can only be faced if we go into the peculiarity or, if we prefer the words, into the element of surprise in it. But our aim must be not to snatch at the right to pass a verdict of condemnation, but to understand the peculiarity that undoubtedly exists, as something essentially intelligible.

The demand used to be made that genius, if it was really to deserve the name, should draw from its native resources what had never yet been expressed, that it should present us with a spiritual world of intimate personal stamp. How far any such demand is justified need not now be asked;

we need only observe that another appraisalment, distinct from that which might appear as the obvious and only possible one, can be imagined. For this appraisalment the completely perfect would rank above the original, the self-dependent and self-assured above the striving after ends only guessed at or not even known. Preference is given to that which has achieved form over the creations of original genius, to which the traces of the process of becoming too clearly cling.

With this we have said something that is decisive for the poetry of our epoch. It is not the novelty for novelty's sake that constitutes its charm for us. It invariably goes back to something already present, in order to express it in a worthy and suitable form.

For the Roman, this ready-made element might be present under a variety of forms—as natural system of the world, in the traditional law of society, in an order established by the gods. As one example of many, let us select the relation to tradition or, what amounts to the same thing, to the historical past. The age of Augustus is characterized by its selection, from the many possible attitudes, of one of self-examination, of reflection about the bases of its own being and a conscious return to them. This attitude is expressed both in face of the Greek models and of the history of Rome and in both cases expressed in the same direction. The aim is not merely to extend the world that is inherited and lead it beyond itself; it is at least as much to preserve it in its content and its significance. An innovation in this case will be most successful if it succeeds in developing out of the old and traditional their inherent possibilities.

In practice, this tendency was expressed in the need to grasp the pattern, contained for the Roman either in the classical creations of the Greek genius or in the *mos maiorum* and their *exempla*,¹¹ as what it really was, an obligation and a surety. The task of the new generation has, therefore, to include two elements. It must loyally keep and hand on what the fathers in their day learnt and expressed, but it must also realize it in clearer and more convincing manner by advancing from the spirit of the past to new and authoritative formulation. Of this vital process of continued

creation and working within the framework of tradition the words of Augustus are the classic expression, when he boasts : *legibus novis me auctore latis multa exempla maiorum exolescentia iam ex nostro saeculo reduxi et ipse multarum rerum exempla imitanda posteris tradidi.*¹²

But we have as yet only touched on a special case of a general attitude. To the Roman it was natural from the first that reality should be less of a problem to him than it is to us to-day. He is inclined to accept the ordinances given him by nature or human society for what they profess to be. He has no wish to look behind things or to erect a metaphysical structure over them. But while respecting their existence as generally accepted, he confines himself to expressing what is implied in their form as an ideal law. This is true as much of the more practical sphere of law and politics as it is of the spiritual spheres in the stricter sense. It is part of the fundamental attitude of the Roman jurists to derive from the apparently infinite variety of conditions of life clear forms of law that can cover all cases, and that, by a special art in stating the problem ; similarly Roman statescraft often restricts itself to making explicit and raising to legal validity such phenomena and practices as had already established themselves silently under the cover of older and different forms. In both cases the essential is a carrying on and further development ; an order already essentially in existence, a tendency already implied in what had gone before, must be brought to clearer and more palpable expression.

If we look back from this angle on the special attitude of the Augustan poetry, it appears in a flash in a new light. It is very far from being a mere literary phenomenon, one divorced from the general sentiment and become an end in itself. What seemed at first to admit of such an interpretation, the renunciation of originality in the sense of that which had not existed before, the readiness to accept the already present in any form, explicit or implicit, and to make it the theme and object of poetic treatment—all this has its roots deep in the spirit of the age, in the base of Roman character itself. Poetry had now made its own an attitude that had from the first been characteristic of the

community in which fate had set it. Horace, in his letter to Augustus (*Ep.* 2, 1), has given a description of the true poet, in which his work in public, his influence on the education of youth, is sketched.¹³ When we read there *orientia tempora notis instruit exemplis* (180 f.), the agreement between such a new treatment of famous and traditional models and the rôle of the *exempla maiorum* that we have indicated becomes manifest.

With these last remarks our discussion has come back to a point which has already been described as the decisive and fundamental one—the question of the importance of the poet himself, and of the unique rôle of leadership that was allotted to him in this epoch. We should now be clear enough about principles to be able to proceed to interpret the conception which in the Augustan age was raised to a special importance, that of the *vates*.

The age did not create it for the first time for itself, but it did, in all probability, resume it after long disuse and fill it with new meaning. The heightened knowledge of divine things, the vision in intoxication, were traditional; the word itself, which seems to be related to the German *Wut*, points to a sacred madness. But what gave the idea its special value did not lie in this exceptional condition. Horace did, it is true, especially in the 'Roman' Odes, conduct himself as a seer and priest, and thus try to resume the original functions; to this point we shall have to return later. But what filled his soul was, in the first place at least, something of a different nature. The consciousness of seeing things and being allowed to express them, which in some sense lay determined in the present order of the world, whether that might reveal itself in nature, in history and the activities of the nation, but which needed some one to awaken and proclaim them before they could be alive and present to all—this it was that gave the poet his new attitude. If the modernists had preferred the paths that were untrodden by the many, a different endeavour is at play here. The object on which the whole age had fixed its eyes, which was dimly guessed and seen by every man—to express that or, what came to the same thing, to express it in final and worthy form—that was for the *vates* his proper mission,

The age endeavoured to understand this function as the revival of an old and honourable tradition.

In the letter to Augustus that we have already quoted (*Ep.* 2, 1, 126 f.), Horace pictures the activity of the poet, who forms the tender and stammering mouth of the boy, holds up before him his examples, admonishes and consoles him. The description, however, then rises to the picture of the chorus of boys and girls into whose mouths the poet first puts their prayer to the gods. In this was reflected the greatest and most solemn moment in Horace's own life, when his Hymn at the Secular Festival was produced by such a choir. But however certainly we may assert that Horace meant to include a reference to himself and his poem, so certainly must we exclude the thought that he only meant himself or even himself more than others.

The activity of the chorus, as Horace sketches it—prayers for rain, the warding off of sickness and danger, the appeal for peace and fertility—goes far beyond the content of the Secular Hymn itself. There are echoes, as has been observed,¹⁴ of the old Roman function of the *carmen* and of the picture of the earliest national poets. Horace sees himself in one line with them and conceives of his own position as a special case of something that had from of old been characteristic of Rome and Roman character. Just as Livius Andronicus, for example, had once been the first to give artistic form to the religious feelings of the whole citizen-body in his hymn, so does Horace feel himself the chosen shaper and announcer of all that moved his age and environment.

With this result another follows. It is not the case, as the reiterated gibes at Augustan court-poetry would imply, that the poet was merely the mouthpiece of the imperial will. No, he is autonomous, and his claim to be heard rests on very different foundations. It will always remain remarkable how little Horace in the moment of decision felt himself the agent of Augustus. We do not know how the challenge to compose the Secular Hymn came to him, who sent the call to him, who brought it. But even if there is nothing against seeking the initiative of the Emperor in some form or other in the background, the Acts are content

to mention the poet simply in his place; they renounce anything beyond the bare mention of the name. For Horace there was only one view possible; it shows how he represented his work to himself; he was the mouthpiece of the youth on whom the future and hopes of Rome rested. They had recognized him as a *vates* and thus added him to the circle of those inspired bards to whom honour and affection is due.¹⁵ Now he may really hope to be the chosen interpreter of the feelings of his people, and in this sense it was those youths of Rome, and no others, who gave him this rank.

Beyond doubt Horace was conscious that the god spoke from his lips. But it was only that recognition that could raise him to the full rank of bardship as he himself understood and coveted it. Once again is revealed the fact that the word of the poet is carried by the consciousness of the community. The political and religious forces that stir in the community find in the work of the poet their artistic form. On the other hand, this work of the poet turns back to the circle from whence it proceeded; here it essays to raise the general feeling to clarity, to full self-consciousness.

3. This activity of the poet, that implies a corresponding receptivity, a congenial sentiment on the other side, has so far only been followed up in its relation to people and age. The question now rises, how far did Augustus open his own heart to the words of the *vates*? Or, in other words, was this peculiar position, this claim to be organ both of the divine will and of the community, recognized in practical ways by the ruler? The way in which the question is put may seem strange at first; but the answer to it has its effects on Augustan religion.

It need hardly be stressed that both Virgil and Horace voiced a sentiment and attitude that is absolutely in harmony with the order of Augustus. It has, however, recently been emphasized that it was not merely the presence of that order that moved the poets to preach the things that bound them in their hearts to the work of the *princeps*. It is now suggested that at a time when the new elements were scarcely beginning to show themselves, not to speak of reaching their final form, they found their expression in the word of

the poets.¹⁶ Everything that we have learned to describe as the meaning of the system of Augustus, the 'will to order, clarity, moderation, health, conservatism, consistency' ¹⁷—all that is to be found in the poets before ever it was manifested in the renewal of the state by Augustus.

There has been talk of a prearranged harmony between the activities of the *princeps* and the message of the poets. But we must go yet one step farther if we wish to understand the facts in all their strangeness. We must ask whether the priority in time of the poets does not mean that we must speak of them in the part of leaders, in certain cases at least, even as regards the Emperor. Augustus would in that case be not only a creator, but a fulfiller—a fulfiller of those wishes, the expression of which in verse had raised a Horace or Virgil to the height of his poetic mission. If this is so, that same specifically Roman tendency that inclines to take its bearings by a law resident in the objective world, in the surrounding world of fact, already seen to be determinative of the relation of the poet to his people and his age, might also have regulated the attitude of the ruler towards those same poets in a sense as real.

Such a view does not seem to blend well with the traditional picture of the 'real politician', Augustus. And yet it would cost this 'real politician' none of his glory. Certainly it would not for any one who sees political realities not merely in the changing constellations of political forces, but in the enduring political and spiritual formation of a whole nation. If it should appear that in his work was completed in a full measure the 'end' of his epoch, Augustus would satisfy one of the highest demands that can be made on the politician; he would have given practical form, and with it real fulfilment to tendencies already present in his age, already in some degree active in it and forcing their way to the light. The 'real politician' would earn his name, in the sense that he allowed due rank to spiritual realities.

Our discussion here must of necessity be confined to the sphere of religion. Within these limits it may be maintained that important and even decisive actions of the Emperor were often preceded in time, and by no inconsiderable space of time, by suggestions of the poets, whether

presented as visions of the future or in the form of admonitions and demands.

The restoration of the ruined temples by Augustus falls in the year 28 B.C.¹⁸ The last Roman Ode of Horace (3, 6) touches on this occurrence, for it anticipates a lessening of the disaster that threatens to lead Rome to the edge of the abyss, from the restoration of the neglected houses and images of the gods. The poet, it is true, knows nothing about the fulfilment of such wishes; rather, he turns to his contemporaries with emphatic words of warning that in their form remind us of divine oracles.¹⁹ The poem was written, then, before the measures of the Emperor had been executed, even before they had been planned. Only if this is the case can we understand how the last verse looks away from every expression of hope and ends in a gloomy picture of a progressive decay.²⁰

The warning of Horace, then, falls not only before the taking in hand of the restoration, but even before the decree of the senate that empowered Augustus to undertake the task. That the poet was not functioning as a mere mouth-piece for any schemes of the Emperor, that had not yet seen the light of day, is proved by the introductory words of the Roman Odes beyond all possibility of mistake. The appeal to his priestly office takes on a special appearance in this context, when Horace appears as counsel for Roman *religio*. If we read this Ode with discretion and close attention to the wording,²¹ we shall not be able to escape the conclusion that in this case the activity of the Emperor meant the realization of what had first been proclaimed to the world in the words of the *vates*.

With equal certainty can one decide in a second case, which we have now to discuss; but this time we must go back a little to understand it.

The activity of Augustus in building is one of those traits to which the tradition of his life most persistently clung. His grandest achievement in this direction was his own forum, which was erected round the temple of Mars the Avenger. Epoch-making in the development of the treatment of space in monumental architecture, it has also an important place in the history of Roman cult. The shrine

itself was equipped with such privileges that it could become a rival of the Capitol itself.

Let us select for special mention three clauses from the statute of the temple (Dio 55, 10, 3 f.; Suetonius, *Augustus* 29, 2). In this temple the assembled fathers had to decide on war and peace, in it the triumphers had to lay down their rank; in it, once again, conquered standards received their permanent place. This unique position of the new temple of Mars found its visible expression in the erection on both sides of it of the bronze statues of all generals to whom in the course of Roman history triumphs had been granted. The inscriptions on the bases announced name and deeds; ²² in this glorious series of men who, to quote Augustus's own words (Suetonius, *Augustus* 31, 5), had by their victories brought Rome from her beginnings to her greatness, the whole past of the city down to the present day moved before the eyes of the beholder.

In this foundation is expressed a temper that is in general characteristic of the Roman nature. We have already observed that reality confronted the Roman under the guise of time rather than of essence. With an attitude of this kind a similar attitude to history is indissolubly connected. History to the Roman means the temporal sequence of single distinct acts of historical importance. They stand linked to one another in a close and necessary concatenation. For in their sum-total is revealed a fixed plan, something determined by what has been pronounced by divine council (*fatum*). The past is surrounded by a frame which makes events appear as the gradual realization of a whole.

This way of looking at things has been recognized in the historical epic, in special degree in the *Aeneid*. But it finds other forms of expression. Not only in the literary creation, but also in monuments, has the Roman consciousness of history found its expression. There, too, is revealed a special emphasis on time as a form of historical vision. From the beginning, for Plautus, for example, the single day has its individuality,²³ the day and hour of death play a special part for the Roman historian; ²⁴ and so, too, in Roman art ²⁵ the individual moment of history reaches an importance unlike anything seen before. Not in the normal and uni-

versally valid, in the supra-historical element which was characteristic of Greece, but in the representation of such individual moments, did the Roman artist recognize his subject. In the historical relief, and in a form of painting intimately related to it, did they again and again find their expression.

An even greater importance, perhaps, than that of the single moment, the single event, was possessed by the sequence of such moments within the frame of a closed series. Such a series of events, distinct in themselves but linked by a fixed plan in temporal sequence, when translated into picture, is the true meaning of the 'continuous' style.²⁶ It is as old as Roman historical art itself, but it found its most vigorous expression on the reliefs of the Columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius. We all know their pictures representing the single steps of the imperial campaigns—the setting out of the army, marches and buildings of bridges, the Emperor at the head of the march on horse-back. Then follow the battle-order, fighting, victory and pursuit. On the next morning appear the envoys of the barbarians, asking for peace; sacrifices are made to the gods, the bravest of the soldiers receive distinctions. In such scenes, ever new, representing in each case a definite moment and following one another in fixed order, the meaning of the campaign is realized as a whole.

Can we compare with these, not in point of artistic form, but of general attitude to the historical event, the series of victorious generals that found its place on the forum of Augustus?

There is one difference that seems at once to obtrude itself. On the reliefs of both our columns it is the Emperor above all whose activity comes to the fore. He is always present, whether he takes ship in harbour, crosses a bridge, or travels by at the head of his legions. We see him climbing mountains, holding his entry into cities, performing acts of cult and encouraging the troops to battle. In contrast to this single figure of the Emperor, the long series of triumphant generals seems at first sight to present a plurality that can hardly be included in one view. If they are held together by any bond, that bond can only be the ever-invisible activity of the god Mars.

Despite this fact, there does exist an inner relation between the two cases. In that series of victorious generals, too, in the succession of their victories and achievements, is set forth a whole, the history of Rome as a chain of decisive events. In them, in accordance with plan and destiny, the might of the Empire is perfected; but it is manifested not by a succession of 'acts', but of 'actors'. Here, as on the reliefs of the Column of Trajan, the special relation of the Roman to history has found its appropriate expression.

Harder to answer is the question, when such an idea first appeared—the idea of expressing the whole development of Rome by the pictures of her generals and the narration of their exploits. Even if we stretch our circle and bring into view the literature as well as the monuments, it seems hard to find anything truly comparable. Livy does not come into the question, for it is not the great leading figures, but Rome herself, that is his hero. And yet there is one great work, which has already been set beside those triumphant generals of the Forum of Augustus²⁷—I mean the vision of heroes in the sixth Book of the *Aeneid* (756–892). There, too, the great men of Rome appear in historical order—broken only at a few points, and then for reasons that are at once obvious. There, too, the growth of Rome is expressed by the succession of these men and the events in which they played a part; both denote successive steps on the path marked out by destiny and the will of heaven. The path leads from the Alban kings, from Romulus down to Augustus and Marcellus, and the fact that the band of Roman heroes appears to Aeneas as a race not yet born, but awaiting its entry into our world, makes their appearance in history seem the completion of a plan long before established down to its veriest details.

What Virgil caused to pass over his stage as a future prophecy was represented in front of the temple of Mars as something already achieved and still being achieved in the present. It is, then, fundamentally the same conception that was expressed in the episode in the life of Aeneas and in the series of generals, and the agreement can be pursued down into details. Not only is it the same men, who in large part

appear; ²⁸ in the shaping of the style, in the turns of expression in which those glorious deeds are recorded in the inscribed *elogia* of the Forum and in Virgil, a definite contact can be established.

It has been observed that in the dying words of Dido (*Aen.* 4, 655 f.) notes are struck that are familiar to us from the Roman *elogium*. Note how the Carthaginian queen delivers this *elogium* on herself before her death, in full consciousness of her own worth, how she rises to the majesty of the great ones of the early Roman prime.²⁹ Something similar seems to meet us in the vision of heroes. In verses such as—

813 *otia qui rumpet patriae, residesque movebit*
Tullus in arma viros et iam desueta triumphis
agmina—

or—

836 *ille triumphata Capitolia ad alta Corinθο*
victor aget currum, caesis insignis Achivis:
eruet ille Argos, Agamemnoniasque Mycenae
ipsumque Aeaciden, genus omnipotentis Achilli,
ultus avos Troiae, templa et temerata Minervae—

the same tone cannot fail to be heard. This way of narrating deeds is familiar from the triumphal tablets and inscriptions, from the sarcophagi of the Scipios, and not least, as we have already hinted, from the *elogia* of the Forum of Augustus itself (CIL. 1², p. 186 f.). What is here, however, always narrated in the past—*complura oppida de Samnitibus cepit, Sabinorum et Tuscorum exercitum fudit, pacem fieri cum Pyrrho* (*Tyrrho* on the stone) *rege prohibuit*, we read for example of Appius Claudius Caccus—is turned by Virgil, in harmony with his context, into the future tense.³⁰

Finally, that quality of example and admonition that resides in the vision of heroes finds its counterpart in the other place. Augustus himself actually stated that in those men he wished to present from the great past of Rome an example (*exemplar*) to the people; they were at the same time to show what might be expected from the Emperor and his posterity. In view of this there is the more weight in a

final fact, which brings us back to the point from which our thoughts set out.

If we ask where in these two cases the creative act first appeared, the answer must run ; priority in time belongs not to the expression in monument on the Forum of Augustus, but to the poet. With this we reach the same result that we have already reached once before. Again it is the *vates* who was the first to lend expression to an idea that could not only be recognized by the age as authoritative and true to its own sentiment, but that at the same time became a model for the ruler. He seized hold of it and made it into an institution that thenceforth kept its place within the frame of the cult of the state.

We need not here enter into further details—as, for example, the fact that Augustus appears as the bringer of the *aurea saecula* (*Aeneid* 6, 792 f.) long before the Secular festival of the year 17 B.C. The essential should be already clear.³¹ We have already remarked that the general attitude, characteristic of the epoch of Augustus, appeared earlier in the poets than in the state-order and the new institutions connected with it ; we have now found confirmation for this view in the sphere of religion. We may dare to assert that in many cases that have not yet been reckoned up, but that are certainly considerable, the words of the poets had their influence on the direction and form of the actions of Augustus. We have already suggested the consequences involved for the historical picture of his own person and his work of religious reform. Here we would only touch on the question, whether there are any indications that that relation of *vates* and Emperor, that has seemed to result from our last observations, ever found mention in the poet himself. Did the *vates* not merely raise a claim to be the leader of his age and his people, but did he ever appear in his own eyes as the instigator and councillor of the *princeps* ?

Any answer to this question must begin with the realization of the fact that the *vates*, though he may appear as poet, does not appear as layman. From the very first his words rank with other utterances in which the gods make known their biddings to men.

What this means is shown by the famous verse of Ennius,

who mentions the song of the *vates* with that of the *Fauni* as something kindred in character (*Ann.* 214 V). Faunus is here understood as the god of those mysterious voices that sound in the woods and in the untrodden 'outside world' of nature.³³ By them and by his foretelling of the future³³ he gives men his warnings. With this utterance of the god is closely connected in character the conception of *fatum*,³⁴ and this connexion is further expressed in the fact that the same Faunus appears also as *Fatunus* (or *Fatuchus*).³⁵ An Oscan dedicatory inscription from Aeclanum³⁶ has shown us that this god was proper not only to the Latins, but also to ancient Samnium. If on the tables of Iguvium the *templum* of the augurs appears as *verfale* (VI A 8),³⁷ the relationship to the Latin *verbum* shows that to the Umbrians, too, was given the conception of a divine speech, of a divine pronouncement. In the Oscan *Anagtia* there seems to be manifest a deity, who essentially embodies such a pronouncement or voice.³⁸ We cannot undertake to exhaust the subject; it will be enough to remind our readers of a manifestation of the divine voice that enjoyed an importance in history, and that as such received worship in Rome, *Aius Locutius*.³⁹

It is in this context that we must place the *vates*, at least as far as his earliest mode of appearance is concerned. The claim to be prophet not only of the community, but also of the god, must have been a part of the picture from the first. It is remarkable how Horace takes up again the traditional traits and seeks to fill them with a new content. He is never weary of emphasizing his special relation to the Muses, and in one of his greatest poems (*c.* 3, 4, 5 f.) he does not shrink from presenting himself before his audience as the seer, moved to ecstasy by those same Muses. This piece of daring—for such it was, even if it had its model in the Dionysiac trance⁴⁰—goes far beyond the adoption of a mere traditional figure of literary speech.⁴¹ Even if we regard it from a merely external point of view, there is revealed in it a new side, an unexpected enrichment of that already exalted attitude in which the *sacerdos Musarum* appears before the people. If we take this attitude seriously—and no one who has once given himself up to the moving

power of that poem will doubt that Horace here said his final and most profound word about himself and his calling⁴²—it becomes plain that that old and original claim of the *vates* is here renewed, albeit in a form appropriate to the age.

In this same Ode, in which Horace comes before his audience as divinely inspired seer, he has not only expressed what he had to say about his poetry, but also what he had to say about his relation to the *princeps*. It is remarkable how he did this. It might have seemed natural that he should appeal in the presence of the ruler to the divine origin of his office as *vates*. If the god speaks from the mouth of a man, his utterances must rank with the many indications in which the will of heaven is revealed to men. As to them, so to the words of the *vates*, the Emperor would need to attend and receive from them in authoritative form the directions for his actions. But Horace chose to express this in quite another manner.⁴³

First of all, he does not express himself in direct words, but rather in a suggestive picture and with the restraint that is seemly in the presence of the supreme and the most high. It is only the enthusiasm derived from the goddess, we must understand, that has loosed his tongue and enabled the *vates* to give utterance to that which moves him in his heart of hearts. We hear next that the Muses have not only protected and directed Horace himself, but that they 'pour refreshment on high Caesar in a Pierian grot' (37 f.). More follows; just as they fill the *vates* with their spirit and make him what he is, so do they bestow on the ruler 'gentle counsel'—wisdom and a sound mind. He, too, is raised by this *concilium* of the Muses (45) to that which really constitutes his greatness.⁴⁴ As Zeus over the Titans, so had Augustus triumphed over the powers of destruction. They lacked what gave him the victory, the help of the Muses.⁴⁵

It has been supposed that Horace was afraid to say what an earlier age had still dared—that the poet himself, as the chosen mouthpiece of the Muses, has given that 'counsel' to the ruler.⁴⁶ Or, in other words, that attitude and claim that might be expected from the *vates* on the ground of his divine mission has been sought in vain in Horace. True it is that in this poem he has disregarded his own person;

but what he intends to say is essentially the same as before, or something even more significant. We have already observed that it is not the poet himself who refreshes Caesar after his exertions and deeds, or gives him counsel for the future ; it is not the poet, but the Muses. But it is the Muses who work in the poet and raise him to the rank that he enjoys. The same divine spirit that has created poetry goes on to take possession of the ruler and direct him and his actions. What was once expressed in the form of personal relationship of poet and ruler is now raised to the supra-personal plane, to the plane of true being and universal validity. In face of this decisive fact, that a ruler has not closed his heart to the spirit of the Muses, but has allowed himself to be led by them in his actions, it remains of secondary importance whether a rôle of mediation falls to the poet in his individual person or not. He has his poetic function not from himself, but from the goddesses ; it would be improper, then, to confuse great and significant issues with mere personal affairs. It is not the *vates*, then, as definite and single person, but the divine power that works in him, that has determined the action of the Emperor. With this result we may be content. It is the special quality of the classical work of art that, where something apparently personal is expressed, it can coincide with what is generally valid, can appear as no more than its expression.

Chapter V

POETRY AND CULT: THE SECULAR HYMN OF HORACE

AFTER having tried in our last chapter to throw light on the position of the poet in the religion of the age of Augustus, we may now venture on a final step, and try to throw light on the meaning of cult in that age. For whatever we may allow to the poet, any such allowance is still most resolutely refused to this cult and to its great ceremonies. There has been a persistent refusal to see in it anything more than an attempt to revive a world once and for ever lost.

And yet we must insist on the attempt to build a bridge here; not only because our picture would otherwise lack unity and because in an age of so marked a stamp a consistent form must be expected, but because the poetry of the age itself compels us to take the step.

1. The Secular celebration of Augustus in 17 B.C. brought with it, among other innovations, the equalization of Apollo and his sister with the old deities of the Capitol. Even more strongly than in the ordering of the festival does the importance of the gods of the imperial house emerge in the Hymn of Horace. It was devoted to Apollo and Diana before all others, and was therefore sung in front of their shrine on the day of the festival that was reserved to them, the third; the performance on the Capitol was merely a repetition. In the same way, the divine brother and sister do not only appear in the hymn at their proper place—at the close of the second part, which is devoted in particular to the powers of heaven; the first part, too, which is devoted to the *di milichii*¹ worshipped by night, is itself framed within an invocation to Apollo and Diana.

It is significant that their two names stand at the beginning; the choir of boys and girls turns to them with their

petition for hearing. Then comes the prayer proper, addressed to the same deities; never may the sun on his course that is ever renewed look on anything greater than the city of Rome. Here a thought recurs that was already suggested in the public prayer of the Emperor; the *nihil urbe Roma visere maius* points to the petition for increase of the *maiestas* of the Roman people.² But in the hymn the words of the chorus are directed not to any of the gods, to whom sacrifice had been made on the preceding days of the festival, but to the sun, who is reborn every day and brings with his light life and all power and glory.³ The words of the poet thus extend into a more comprehensive and effective picture than can be found in the *concepta verba* of the official prayer. In this, its most beautiful stanza, the poem climbs its first peak and gains a moment's rest.

It has already been observed that the deities named in the Hymn of Horace are the same as those of the Secular celebration itself. In the second half of the poem are invoked Jupiter and Juno with Apollo and Diana, that is to say, the powers to whom sacrifice was made on the three successive *days* of the festival; but the first half, too, comprises a clearly defined circle. If we may be allowed to neglect for a moment the deities who frame it, Apollo and Diana, it mentions the fostering and beneficent goddesses who were worshipped in the three successive *nights*. In Tellus appears, slightly modified, 'Mother Earth'; in the *Parcae* the *Moerae* of the Secular Acts are plain to see; while Ilithyia, last of all, is mentioned by Horace under her own name. He invokes her, however, not in the singular, but in the plural.

Another alteration may be seen in the assigning of the first place in the poem not to the *Parcae*, but to Ilithyia. And it is the first place in importance as well as in sequence. To her alone are devoted three complete stanzas, whilst the *Parcae* and Earth only receive one each. That this peculiarity is due to the central position that the increase of the birth-rate takes in the programme of Augustus has long since been recognized and is practically stated by Horace himself (17 f.). The function of Ilithyia is, however, important not merely in general for the good of the

state, but also for the celebration of the Secular festival itself.

On her blessing it depends whether the next age will bring a repetition of the games with more to share in them (*frequentis* 24).⁴ The vivid words of Horace, that represent the circle of 110 years as creator not only of the next festival, but also of those who are to participate in it and of the numerous posterity that this implies, remind us of a custom of the Secular festival. At the scenic performances that followed the sacrifices by night a *sellisternium* of the traditional kind took place; it was celebrated by 110 matrons, specially nominated by the *quindecimviri*; Juno and Diana had each a seat laid for her. The performance of this ritual, which is always paid to female deities and goes hand in hand with the *lectisternium*, marks those matrons as bearers of a special dignity. Their number, agreeing with the years of a *saeculum*, their quality of matrons, the fact that they appear in the train of the goddesses of women and of birth, Juno and Diana, all combine to prove that the 110 years appear as mothers, as creators and fosterers of the numerous posterity that is desired. Let us now compare the stanza of Horace:

*certus undenos deciens per annos
orbis ut cantus referatque ludos
ter die claro totiensque grata
nocte frequentis.*

It will be seen that the idea of the years that bring posterity with them has here found its poetic expression. But once again—in contrast to the Acts, which provided *sellisternia* on all three nights⁵—the idea is combined by Horace with Ilithyia only, not with the *Parcae* and with Tellus. The pre-eminence of that goddess finds again its visible form.

But far beyond these modifications, permissible to any poet and, indeed, his proper right, goes the content of the third strophe. Nothing at all comparable to it can be found in the ritual of the festival. The more urgent is our need to answer the question of what this prayer to the sun means and how it came into its present place.

Through the invocation of the sun at the beginning of

the whole hymn, and through the mention of earth and moon at the close of its first half (29 f.; 36), the great powers of the universe are confronted with one another. We cannot overlook the fact that this effect is an intentional one.⁶ But we have as yet no answer to the question why the poet should have ventured to make a place for the heavenly light of the sun within the close circle of the deities of the Secular Games. We might find an answer by referring to the words of the Sibyl, whose instructions lay at the roots of the festival. She speaks of Phoebus Apollo, who is also named Helios (46 f.), and this evidence becomes important when we recall that the oracle probably owes its origin to the resolution to introduce a new Secular cycle.⁷ If it was actually composed specially in view of the festival in project, it gives us an authentic statement of the way in which Apollo was to be regarded. That this Sibylline oracle had decisive importance for the poet as well as for the ceremonial celebration is proved by the repetition of some of its phrases in the very words of the Hymn of Horace.⁸

With this, the identification of Sol and Apollo in the hymn might appear as a certain fact. This view has been championed⁹ and confuted¹⁰ with equal decision. If we would enter anew into the question, we must not restrict ourselves to testing the arguments that have already been advanced. If we really wish to improve on the attempts that have been made at a solution, we must bring more seriously into account all the possibilities at our disposal.

At quite an early date Apollo was brought into connexion with the sun. In the *Bassarai* of Aeschylus we hear that Orpheus gave to the Helios, whom he worshipped as supreme deity, the name of Apollo, and the same identification recurs in the *Phaethon* of Euripides (*fr.* 781, 11 f. N.¹¹). In another passage Aeschylus describes the rays of the sun with the same word (*φοῖβος*), which was a secondary name of Apollo (*Prom.* 22). For the Orphics, too, an identification of the two gods existed. But there also appears a much looser connexion, which always shows some relation, without going as far as a complete amalgamation of the two. This is particularly noticeable in the cults of the Greek motherland (in contrast to the Greeks of Asia Minor). At the Attic

festivals of Apollo, for example, mention is made of Helios, but there is no identification of the two deities.

The reason for this variation is to be sought in the nature of the sun-god himself. Whilst Apollo is in the most marked sense a spiritual figure, whose nature is based on no natural occurrence and no element, Helios always remained bound by a close link to the physical sun.¹¹ An identification of the two powers could not therefore be completely achieved; it missed their full and proper being. Only as giver of light, the most sublime and godlike element, not as mere cosmic force, could Helios be bound in unity to Apollo.

We must not begin, then, with any expectation of a single explanation for the age of Horace. For that age, too, it is true that the mutual attraction of the two gods runs through different stages. A single example will make this clear. Whereas the Sibylline oracle identified Apollo and Helios, and the same path was trodden by learned speculation and even in rarer cases by cult,¹² Propertius, in his description of the Palatine temple, speaks, it is true, of the chariot of the sun-god having stood on its roof, but has nothing to say of his identity with the owner of the shrine.

In this context we may remind ourselves of a work of Augustan art, the relief on the cuirass of the statue of Augustus of Prima porta. In the centre is the restoration of the lost standards, below it are Apollo and Diana with their torches, both seated on griffins and riding towards one another; still lower down is Tellus with the twins. To her, on the upper edge, corresponds Caelus, who holds the mantle of the sky spread above him; below, on the left, is Helios on his chariot, while on the other side, hurrying away before him, is the goddess of the dew with a second female figure, which we have still to discuss. The restoration of the standards is thus carried out in the presence of heaven and earth.

Very significant is the place that Apollo and Diana take in the composition as a whole. Just as he corresponds in the arrangement of the picture to the sun-god, so does she to the two goddesses, who hurry away before his chariot. Of the two, the goddess of the dew is clearly defined, but who is the other? She has hitherto been identified as Eos,

carried by her companion on her shoulder. But why does she turn back towards the sun-god instead of hurrying away from him, as we might have expected? It is obvious that, in her movement to the left, she corresponds to Diana, who also rides left below her; both of them carry the torch, the symbol of the *Noctiluca*. This fact, and the fold of mantle above her head, leave no doubt that we have here to do with Luna.¹³ With the approach of day the goddess who gives the dew bears the queen of night with her from the scene; ¹⁴ turning backwards, the queen casts one last glance on the scene that is being enacted at her feet. This means that Diana and the moon correspond to one another on the right side of the relief. The same must hold good for Apollo and the sun-god on the left side. Again we find an unmistakable connexion between the two, but again we cannot speak of a complete identification.

We have now outlined the preconceptions from which our understanding of the Secular Hymn must proceed. At the very beginning we get a hint that Apollo and Diana are to be regarded in their relation to the heavenly sphere:

Phoebe silvarumque potens Diana
lucidum caeli decus. . . .

This can only mean that the second epithet (*lucidum caeli decus*) is to be applied to Diana, too. That for Horace she is identical with the moon is proved by the later stanza, in which she is directly addressed as Luna (35 f.). Beside Diana-Luna stands in the first place Apollo, described as Phoebus. In view of the meaning of this name that we have already mentioned we might expect to find a similar relation for these two. The later verse (61 f.):

Augur et fulgente decorus arcu
Phoebus,

shows that Horace felt the original meaning, the 'shining One', and used it to produce a special effect (*fulgente arcu*). But does that mean that Apollo is identified with the sun? Our previous results counsel caution, and so does the poet himself. In the sixth Ode of the last Book, Horace addresses the god as *Phoebe, qui Xantho lavis amne crinis* (26). Here

again appears the relation to Phoebus, here again the picture of the *χρυσσοκόμης* reminds us of the sun-god. But there is no identification of the two, although again in that poem Apollo's sister, Diana, is directly understood as the moon (89 f.).

A decisive answer is given by the third stanza. That stanza, it is true, may once again lead us to a relation of Apollo and the heavenly sign. For only if some such cosmic relation is true for him, too, can we understand how the prayer could be directed to the divine brother and sister, that never may the sun look on anything greater than Rome. But, once again, it would be wrong to identify Apollo outright with the sun. The objections that have been advanced to such an identification still hold good to-day. The understanding of the passage as a whole, however, requires a new interpretation.

Whilst Apollo and Diana are addressed in imperative form, for the sun the form of a wish is chosen.¹⁶ Both forms recur in connexion; in the first part of the poem there is no mistaking the endeavour to present a regular interchange.¹⁸ But whilst for Ilithyia both forms of invocation occur, the expression of a wish only occurs for Sol and Tellus; from Tellus is desired a gift of blessing and fruitfulness. The absence of a direct address shows that she is conceived in quite an impersonal form, as element, as earth herself. With scarcely less clearness is the same idea expressed in the third strophe. Even the mention of the chariot does not necessarily point to the figure of the sun-god; the daily rebirth certainly fits in well with the picture of the physical sun.¹⁷ The words

*possis nihil urbe Roma
visere maius,*

while giving a direct address, still show that the fulfilment of the wish does not depend on the sun himself. That can only be expected from Apollo. We remember how in the Orphic view Apollo holds the universe in motion by the tunes of his lyre, and how the plectrum with which he strikes it is the sun himself.¹⁸ Or we may think of a picture that meets us in the post-Augustan literature; the Emperor as

divine lord of destiny is identified with Phoebus as charioteer of the sun, or placed at his side.¹⁹

In this case we obtain a different result from Diana and her relation to the moon. Sun and Apollo are not one and the same, but the god appears as his master and thus as director of the fate of the world.²⁰ This last distinction, which has already been seen in the contrast of divine figure and power of the physical cosmos, is again expressed here. On the one side stands the god, on the other the star of heaven that is subject to his will.

All that still remains to ask is why Horace ever placed Apollo and Diana in this cosmic setting. To answer this question will involve a consideration of the structure of the Secular Hymn as a whole.

2. The deities of the first two days, Jupiter and Juno, are neither named as such in the poem of Horace nor presented in any other form.

The neglect is so complete that it was only the discovery of the Acts that enabled us to recognize in the verse (49)

quaque vos bubus veneratur albis

the reference to the deities of the Capitol—in the ordering of the festival it was to them that white oxen were sacrificed. Horace has preferred, instead of speaking of these special deities, to refer to them in general terms. This was the easier for him, as Jupiter can actually be named in alternation with the plurality of gods.²¹

It has been suggested that this was a mistake on the part of the poet.²² Or else the excuse has been found for him that, with the white oxen, he was mentioning a sacrifice which 'every one who had shared in the sights of the past two or three days was bound to hold in vivid memory'.²³ But at the best that would only mean that Horace might venture to confine himself to this mere hint. Why the poet behaved so and not otherwise still requires explanation.

The Hymn was devoted to Apollo and Diana, and their dominant position was intended to find expression not only in the first part, but also beyond it. Especially at the place where the two had their place by right, in the second half, they must be pushed into the foreground. This could

only be done at the expense of their two partners, Jupiter and Juno. That is the reason why the last two names must not be mentioned,²⁴ and for the same reason nothing was admitted that could make them appear in their individual character. Horace's plan was to contrast Apollo and Diana as clearly defined and vividly conceived figures with the generality of the gods, behind which general and undefined conception the deities of the Capitol must find a shelter.

Once again it becomes evident what a high degree of transformation Horace allowed himself. This is not confined to the position of the deities of the Palatine; it is revealed likewise in the way in which those deities are viewed and introduced into the poem.

After Apollo and Diana have been invoked together in the first verse at the beginning of the prayer proper, the god appeared alone as guider of the globe of the sun. Diana, on the other hand, came at the close of the first part, again alone, as Luna. The two deities, then, whether identified with the heavenly bodies, or as their rulers, surround the stanzas devoted to the *di milichii*. This form of presentation the more emphatically determines the character of the first half of the hymn, inasmuch as it stands in contrast to the further development. There, too, the divine pair encounter us, but without standing in any relation to sun or moon.

The contrast is reinforced by the fact that a wide agreement is none the less present in both cases. When we are told of Apollo that he will guide the destiny of Rome and Latium to ever happier times (66 f.), and of Diana that she will graciously hear the petitions of the chorus (69 f.), the latter corresponds as clearly to the wish expressed at the beginning and end of the first part as does the former to the content of the stanza about the sun. What was first implored now appears as surely in prospect; and the certainty is enhanced by the stress laid on the consent of Jupiter and the other gods. But whereas at the beginning Apollo revealed himself as guider of destiny through his power over the sun, the same thought at the close is no longer expressed under the picture of a lord and master of the cosmos, but in

quite a general form. So, too, Diana appears as goddess present in bodily person, not as cosmic power.

We have here a vivid realization, set in deliberate contrast to the pictures of the prelude. Every possible means is employed to present the two, Apollo and Diana, in single personal form before the audience, instead of generalizing them into the cosmic sphere. Apollo is the seer and archer, helpful physician and lord of the Palatine temple : Diana is the goddess of Aventine and Algidus. But before we can explain this state of things, we require to go back some little way.

It was the novelty of the Augustan Secular celebration that the former age was not, as at previous celebrations, carried to the grave with its guilt and its woe, but that the beginning of an epoch of happy promise was held in prospect. A conception like that of the coming age of bliss, as Virgil had pictured it in his Fourth Eclogue, here found its expression in cult. That is why it is not the lords of the dead, Dis and Proserpina, that are invoked, but the beneficent powers of nature and the gods of heaven, who guide the destinies of the state. The two combine to form an intelligible order. They each represent a side of reality, as implied in the world. Each deity, then, has his proper place assigned him ; beginning from below with the natural powers and rising from them to the higher and spiritual, all are fitted into a system of divine existences.

One cannot mistake the distinction, on which we have just touched, between the fruitful and beneficent powers and those deities who belong to the high circle of the heavenly powers—in the one case, we have the *Moerae*, *Ilithyiae* and Mother Earth ; in the other, Jupiter, Juno, Apollo and Diana. To the latter a sacrifice is made by day, to the former by night. In harmony with the character of the festival, it is not night with her terrors and her dangers, her darkness and baleful enchantment, but night as the bringer of kindly fate.²⁵ To quote the words of Horace, she is the *grata nox* (28-4).

Natural operations and night, then, heavenly being and light of day, appear as phenomena that are set in relation to one another. With this point is connected a second.

It is characteristic of the heavenly powers that they appear as clear and single shapes ; the powers linked to nature, on the other hand, are marked by a certain indefiniteness. If we neglect Mother Earth, who is the element that includes all, the *Moerae* and the *Ilithyiae*, in the Secular Acts at least, are given in the plural. In the case of all such deities it may be observed that they appear either as individuals or in a larger company.²⁶ Their nature is changeable and variable,²⁷ their plurality implies a lack of definiteness in their form of appearance. Just as the clearly defined figure is necessarily allotted to the clear day, so are these less clearly shaped beings assigned to the night that has no boundaries.

Yet another pair of contrasts plays a part in the scheme. On the one hand, all the deities that meet us are feminine ; among the heavenly powers the male element, Jupiter and Apollo, predominates. Though Juno and Diana stand beside them, it is only in a subordinate place. It almost looks as if it was felt that their feminine nature implied a reference to the opposite sphere. To the two, Juno and Diana, are devoted the *sellisternia* of the matrons, of which we have spoken ; they are the only ones in the higher circle to whom worship is paid in the hours of night. On the other hand, the prayer of the Emperor, which accompanies the offering of white cows to Juno on the second day of festival, is attended by a prayer of the matrons. Finally, to this contrast of male and female element corresponds the institution of a double choir. When the Secular festival in Republican times was devoted alone to the powers of the underworld, it did not go beyond the song and dancing of twenty-seven girls.²⁸ With the appearance of the heavenly powers was added to the former choir a similar choir of an equal number of boys.

Here we have displayed, in its main features at least, a system, the basic idea of which implies a building of the divine world in a series of storeys. Horace could never have been the *vates*, the proclaimer of divine wisdom, the poet who believed himself to possess in the experience of a religious and civic community the justification for his own activity,²⁹ if he had not found in these facts some hints for his own poetic presentation. It was always his way to give

new shape by the power of his poetic experience to all those ideas that came to him from the present or the tradition of religion,³⁰ and in this special case he did not hesitate to reshape in grand and authoritative style what was already suggested in germ by the ordering of the festival itself.

The authorities responsible for the festival had so ordered it that the sacrifices offered were different in every case, but that the prayers that followed the sacrifices should always maintain the same form of words. In these prayers the gods were asked to give protection and increase of the Empire and people in peace and war, victory for the army and prosperity for the citizens, the college of *quindecimviri* for the Emperor himself and his family. In contrast with this uniformity, it is characteristic of Horace that his hymn does not cling to the stiff formulæ of the *concepta verba*, but expands into a wealth of the most diverse pictures, wishes and subjects. This was incumbent on him for the sake of the poem as such; but it would not be right to see in it no more than an effort to attain variety and lively change. The Hymn of Horace has its strict order, too, but it is an order of its own.

The instructions given in an inscription of Magnesia to the sacred herald and others (among them *παῖδες ἑννέα ἀμφιθαλεῖς* and *παρθέναι ἑννέα ἀμφιθαλεῖς*) has been quoted for comparison.³¹ At the festival of Zeus Sosipolis they are to pray for blessings for city and land, for citizens, women, children and all other inhabitants, for peace and prosperity, and finally, for the welfare of corn, fruit and beasts. There is an arrangement, then, by subjects. Beginning with the state and men, it extends over the whole range of physical well-being to the yield of the field and to the care of the herds. There is much here that can be compared with the gifts that the Roman choir craves. Horace, however, groups his poem not by subjects, but by the character of his gods.

In choosing his order he went back to the ideas that had already found expression in the ordering of the festival itself. In it the sacrifice by night was allotted to the *dī milichii*, to whom was proper the preference for the unformed and for the feminine element, while to the gods of heaven corresponded the day and the dominance of the male; Horace,

too, deliberately carried this contrast between the elemental and natural and the spiritual, and defined a stage further. With full logic he directs to the former the petition for physical well-being, whilst with the latter ethical and political factors come to the fore.³² In the one case the prayer is for the protection of mothers and the blessing of children; in the other it is for sound morals for the young and quiet peace for the old (45 f.). The petition for *probi mores* is something entirely new in this form³³ and marks the independence and novelty of the conception of Horace. If at the same time wealth and increase is asked for the whole people, this simply resumes thoughts of the first part, while at the same time extending them by the addition of the words *decus omne* (48). By those words must be meant something new, something that goes beyond mere physical well-being—or, in other words, the honour and glory of the Roman people. The increase of external power and the return of the old virtues find their proper connexion here—they again represent an ethical and political factor.

But Horace even went one step farther. The dedication of the whole hymn to Apollo and Diana found its expression in its structure. To both was allotted a unique position, not only placing them in the circle of the powers of heaven, but relating them at the same time to the powers of nature. This peculiarity, while expressing the object of the hymn, was further used by Horace to realize a new and independent creation of his own.

We have already duly emphasized the fact that Apollo and his sister appear at first in connexion with the heavenly signs of sun and moon, but that thereafter, in the second part of the poem, they are released from this connexion and shown simply as divine figures. The meaning to be given to this change will now appear more clearly than was possible before. To put it briefly, Horace has used the change to make each context illustrate special sides of the nature of the two deities. As long as they were linked to the powers of nature or of the cosmos (or of Tellus), such connexions came into greater prominence for Apollo and Diana as well. Apollo is the charioteer of the globe of the sun, who is invoked in his turn as *almus Sol*. The 'nurturing' sun is the

right counterpart to the nourishing earth,³⁴ who appears as the third of the *di milichii*. Diana, as moon, belongs to the same circle.³⁵ Horace is here his own best commentator, when he describes her in the sixth Ode of his last book as (89 f.)

*prosperam frugum celeremque pronos
volvere menses.*

On the other hand, the connexion with the heavenly powers implies that Apollo and Diana appear as spiritual divinities.

We can now give expression to our results. Horace carried the thoughts on which the Secular celebration rested to their ultimate conclusion. A final comment now forces itself on us, that brings us back to the point from which we set out. Basing themselves on the view there defined, scholars have not scrupled to see in the Secular festival no more than an effective form of divine service, designed above all to work upon the feelings of the great masses.³⁶ A less external and less prejudiced valuation must now take its place, which shall no longer deny recognition to the novelty and greatness of what the age produced in this sphere. Let us not hesitate to aver that in the festival of the year 17 B.C. a genuine religious sentiment found its expression in cult. The intensity and depth with which Horace grasped its meaning and gave it expression in his festal hymn gives a testimony, against which there can be no appeal.

Book V

THE EMPIRE

Chapter I

THE CAUSES OF THE GREATNESS OF ROME

1. **T**HE question of the causes of the greatness of Rome is one of the classic questions in the whole of historical science. Since Polybius first raised it, it has never settled down to rest. Men of the rank of Machiavelli and Montesquieu, Niebuhr and Mommsen, have given us their answers to it. And it has always been understood that such an answer goes far beyond its narrower professional purpose and defines the whole attitude of an age to state and history.

It is only with hesitation that a late-comer ventures to approach the subject. If he does so venture, as indeed he must, it is because our age has its own contribution to make to the question—a contribution appropriate to its character. The need to do this is the more obvious because the answers, which have been contributed by a school of historians only just past, no longer represent what in our belief can to-day be said on the subject of the greatness of Rome.

It cannot, indeed, be denied that the attempts at solution that the past two decades have given us are harmonious in themselves. Whoever the author, whatever the decision in detail, they all agree in this—that it was the will to power of the Roman people and Roman policy in which we had to seek the cause of Rome's greatness. That this answer was given with such unanimity should not for a moment surprise us. In an age which styled itself the age of imperialism, which could represent what it called 'the politics of reality' as a datum and the 'politics of force' as an end in itself, it was only too easy for the rise of the Roman Empire to be conceived exclusively under these categories. It could even be thought that this was the only possible way to dispose of the subject.

It is apparent, of course, that those categories of 'will to power', 'imperialism', or whatever we choose to name them, are far from representing anything self-evident. On the contrary, they carry in themselves a question which does not exactly recommend them as a point of departure.

We are no longer disposed to accept imperialism without further ado as the badge of our age. A fight for power would imply that something, which is essentially means, has been turned into an end in itself. Power by itself has no meaning; it can be creative or destructive, helpful or oppressive. It was only an age of positivist and 'technical' thought, not creative in itself, but competent at finding practical applications for what had once been created, that could thus confuse its actions with the motives for its actions.

Furthermore, that very event, which seemed to mark the climax and consummation of the imperialistic age, has proved the insufficiency of the idea of power, at least in its claim to explain facts. The peoples, who in the world-war vied with one another in sending the flower of their youth to the field of battle, would hardly have raised a finger at the appeal of the mere principle of power. Ideas of quite another order, more ideal and more deeply moving—self-devotion, love of country, faith in the future, these three above all others—were needed to nerve the peoples to such sacrifices.

Finally, in the years since the War what was before only visible in its first beginnings has reached fulfilment. What I mean is the formation of those great groups of political ideas which are no longer confined to single peoples, but which encompass whole groups of nations. However heavily and inexorably the narrowing of the economic field of play, the fight for raw materials and markets may press on us, those systems of ideas are so powerful that they must be brought into action in the struggle for economic self-preservation. Only by their aid can one maintain oneself in this struggle.

No people and no state can dispense with these systems. The cheap assertion that they are mere catch-words, good enough to serve the immediate purpose of mobilizing popular opinion, misses the decisive point. Such a conception, in

terms of the politics of reality, would run the risk of overlooking the decisive, the spiritual realities. In the system of political ideas of a people you touch on the base of its existence; it refinds itself as a creation of history and a political force in action in those ideas. From them it draws strength to overcome distress and defeat; in the great moments of its history it finds what it has always craved and esteemed in dazzling style confirmed. A mere catchword could hardly achieve such results.

It is the system of political ideas, then, that gives to power its meaning and content; it is this that determines its use. This implies that our research, at the very moment that it tries to set out from the previous view, is led in a direction that wanders far from that point of departure. A question which at first steered for power and power alone now finds itself suddenly directed to the spiritual foundations of policy.

The politics of power always means something that in its essence is universally valid and intelligible by reason. The reference of definite actions and events to the tendencies of this policy has always, whether one wishes it or not, a levelling quality; the concrete individual case is subjected to a general principle and, if it may be, explained by it. We talk of a Roman policy of power, but the fact remains that we can also talk of a policy of power for other peoples, states and ages. And in that case the reference of historical events to this principle furnishes us with a form of calculation which disentangles in rational and clear style means and ends, cause and effect, plan and execution.

A system of political ideas, on the other hand, such as belongs to a distinct people, is nothing general, but something supremely singular. It is bound fast to the individual character of that people. And inseparable from this is the fact that such a system is in its nature irrational. It can employ rational forms from grounds of expediency—in the political speech, in the party programme, in debate or elsewhere—but it only makes use of these forms, it can never base itself on them or lose itself in them.

One final contrast may at least be suggested. Whilst the politics of power invariably aim at successes that can be immediately grasped, whilst it is always directed towards

worldly and, as a rule, supremely mundane objects, systems of political ideas are never confined within such limits. There is always the possibility, if no more, that they will touch the sphere of metaphysics; they are occasions of faith. This principle will come to have special importance in the case of Rome.

2. We shall come to the same result if we neglect general considerations of this kind and fix our attention on the individual case. It will be advisable to re-think the thoughts of those who have championed the 'will to power' as the foundation of the greatness of Rome.

In a speech, the title of which has deliberately been adopted here, R. Heinze¹ has shown how characteristic for the Roman state were the constant devotion to the commonweal, the careful choice of the chief magistrates and the steady direction that that implied. Heinze is likely to have been right once again in insisting that those two peculiarities formed indispensable requisites for a policy of successful extension of power continued over centuries. But the question still remains open—what induced Rome to undertake such a policy? The answer which is given to this question is the least satisfactory imaginable. To trace back the will to extension of power, as Heinze does, to an 'instinct for the development of power and the enjoyment of power for its own sake', or, again in another passage, to try and base the politics of power on the passion to rule, ends in something very like tautology.

Heinze's proceedings become intelligible, if no more convincing, when we remember that in his line of thought he was availing himself of the ideal types of Spranger. The Roman for him was identical with the 'social' or 'power' man, who may also be called after his favourite occupation the 'political' man; as a main type of individuality he would represent a basic fact of mental life. It was only natural that the attempt should have been made to find a less theoretical form of proof, and in doing so to pass beyond Heinze.

This did not involve a mere taking over of the thoughts of Heinze. But in one main point a fixed line of march was still pursued, especially when it was a case of recognizing

'the motives of the Roman politics of power'.² All the capacities of the Roman character, we were told, were subordinated to a direction of the will, by which the whole structure of the Roman was determined—the will to power.³ Here we meet once again the astounding fact that the politics of power has its source in the will to power. Again we must resignedly accept the fact that an obvious tautology is foisted on us in place of an explanation.

The appeal, it is true, was no longer made to a doctrine of psychological types; more palpable evidence was sought from a recourse to Roman institutions and actual expressions of Romans. But it was no question of simply listening to the testimonies, in which Romans expressed themselves about the growth and meaning of their Empire or about their own character. Another path was taken; the attempt was made to support with 'proofs' a view which was taken from the first as certain.

An important part was allotted to the Roman conception of force. We were reminded at once of the unrestricted domestic force of the *pater familias*, we recognized the same method in the political community which was built up on the principles of command and obedience, and found from this point, though not without the exercise of some agility, the way to the Roman politics of power. The same will to power which was met with in the first instances was revealed likewise in the latter. It had the tendency to 'adapt and subject its environment to itself'.⁴

The champions of this view have, it will be seen, been guilty of the oversight of identifying force and power. If domestic force were really the will to power, we should indeed have to make shift with the conclusion that the foundation of the Roman Empire was no more than a translation on the gigantic scale of the picture of the Roman domestic tyrant. The fact, however, remains that the 'caprice' (*Willkür*) of the father of the family and magistrate, to use the expression of Mommsen, represented in its legal sense a free judgement.⁵ Even if Roman thought allowed a wide scope to such judgement, even if the idea of forcible command, in its application and its restriction, pervades the whole of the state, yet we are still moving in the sphere of

law. But law, as the maintenance of a once established order, is utterly and completely divorced from power and extension of power, which recognizes no established principles, but constantly breaks them, ever appealing to its own 'right' of the stronger. No method of constructing history can succeed in combining these two incompatibles.

The other evidence that has been adduced is of variable quality. The strongest impression will probably be made by the verses of Virgil, in which he speaks of the call of the Romans to rule the nations (*Aeneid* 6, 851 f.). They do really set our feet on solid ground, even if not quite in the way that has been supposed.

Perhaps the most important advance beyond the views of Heinze has consisted in the refusal to claim for Rome an absolutely unlimited striving after power, a rule at any cost. With complete justice have we been referred to such factors as reveal, for the earlier times at least, a procedure by way of law. It must be obvious to every unprejudiced person that the legal obligations, on which the system of alliances in Italy was based, long gave Roman policy its stamp. The recognition of these facts led, it is true, to a fairly serious conflict with the original view of a will to power implanted once for all in Rome. It was all the stranger that scholars still clung to it undismayed. Strangest of all appears the fact that the verses of Virgil were actually adduced to prove it.

For, be it carefully observed, the poet does not speak of a mere ruling and lording it over other peoples, of a government of caprice, that the Romans have to establish. What he does speak of is a *regere imperio*; Roman rule is set up, it is true, on the basis of Rome's own judgement, but this judgement is still based on legitimate force (*imperium*). It is not the striving after power, but the will to erect a system of order, that is expressed; that is the destiny to which the Roman is called. Only with such an order, which is essentially law, does the content of the following verses agree; 'to lend to peace morality and law', 'to pardon those who duly submit', and 'to break in war the defiance of the proud'.

There is yet another lesson that we can learn from the verses of Virgil.

As we have seen, the attempt has been made to explain the policy of Rome on psychological grounds. The will to power of the Roman has been spoken of as a trait of character that determined the Roman character, as a primary fact of psychology. Not so Virgil. The form under which the nation receives the stamp of its mission is that of a divine calling; ^a the solemn address to the 'Roman' finds its counterpart in an old Sibylline oracle.⁷ If Rome, then, is to set up an ordered society among the peoples, it is because she has been commissioned by the gods to do so.

We are a long way now from all psychological considerations. We catch a glimpse of a divine order and creation which, while bidding some peoples make images of bronze and stone or trace the courses of the stars, gives Rome with the rest her sphere and her task. We have already spoken of a system of political ideas that can decisively influence the conduct of a whole people. We can now dispense with this expression, which we were bound at first to adopt for better or worse, to arrive at the beginnings of an understanding, and can recognize that, for Virgil at least, we may speak of a certainty that the Roman is due by divine promise, or even by divine command, to lead the peoples.

Of the will to power as cause and of the politics of power as end of the Romans there is no word. Every state, of course, needs power, and so, too, does the Roman; nothing could be further from our purpose than to deny this. But that does not mean that one is entitled to use the concept of power as a universal panacea for history. Rather is it our task to determine where it is and where it is not in place. For Rome, at least, we must allow room for the view that in the place of an elementary striving for power that can be derived from nothing else, we must substitute a striving after power that is based on spiritual conditions; in the place of a blind instinct we shall place the consciousness of a mission, which uses power as an instrument for its realization. The further conclusion is involved, that such power, when place is allotted to it, is never cause or end in itself, but simply and solely a means. That implies that this conception of power, important as it may be in other

respects, ceases to have any part in a discussion of the causes of the greatness of Rome. The vision of a poet, and not of any chance poet, but of that poet whom Rome accounted her greatest, directs us to the sphere of religion. But there is yet one more lesson that our poet has to teach us, if we will only listen to what he has to say.

The words about the mission of Rome form the close of the great speech of Anchises, in which he shows Aeneas the future generals and heroes of Rome. It begins with the glory awaiting his own line and his Italian posterity. Anchises is desirous of giving his son verbal accounts of them (v. 759); after that, turning to him, he continues: 'and to you I will tell your *fate*'. The change of expression is due to the fact that in the first case the heroic figures of Rome stand before the eyes of them both; assembled in the Elysian Fields, they await their ascent to the world of the living. These figures are presented to the eye, and they, therefore, like a picture of many figures, only need a few words of explanation and interpretation in detail. But in the other case the destinies of Aeneas still lie in darkness; what they are and what they will in future bring, his father has to tell him. And once again there is a distinction in those verses (851 f.) in which Anchises speaks of the mission of Rome. Hitherto he had been interpreting the divine will or communicating it to the man whom it concerned; now his speech rises to the height of authority. In uttering those verses as a demand and a promise, he once and for all fixes beyond revoke the historical meaning of Rome.

The form in which Anchises expresses himself, then, goes through various stages. Fate or, to use the Roman word, *fatum* is, to judge by the words of Virgil, only what is said about the future of Aeneas. But the change of form in the expression, which we have just observed, should not blind us to the fact that in the vision of heroes equally the *fatum* of Rome is intended. This is proved by the structure of the speech of Anchises itself, which inseparably links the two, the destiny of Aeneas and the destiny of Rome (887 f.). But, as it is a picture that is being shown here and at most explained, whereas *fatum* in etymology and meaning denotes what is 'said', and therefore fixed as divine determination,^a

the expression ought not to be used for the pictures of the future of Rome; but it is only the expression against which objection can be raised. In the highest and most proper sense the verses about the Romans and their government of the peoples are a *fatum*. While they are 'spoken' and 'said', they fix the destiny of Rome.

In a description of the Delphic oracle, another Roman poet, a successor of Virgil, raises the question of the god who speaks to men at that site. Who is it who is at work there? Does he communicate what is *fatum*, or does he fix *fatum* by commanding in his pronouncements? (Lucanus, *Phars.* 5, 52 f.). Here we have two forms—one corresponding to the prophecy of the destiny of Aeneas and, in a weakened sense, to the discussion of the vision of heroes by Anchises; the other, which causes fate to be fixed by the mere command, to the verses about the calling of Rome.

In Homer, too, we occasionally find that the prophecy of destiny and destiny itself is identified.⁹ Corresponding to prophecies, that at a certain moment some one will be overtaken by fate (X 303) or his own hour of death (Σ 465), are passages in which the announcement of destiny overtakes the victim (ν 172). What is only hinted in the Greek view is carried out in the Roman to its logical conclusions. For *fatum* always implies not merely the course of events determined by the gods, but the very *numen* of the prophetic word itself.¹⁰ There is nothing essentially new in this for the student of Roman religion, but it is vital to keep hold of it, for it is of decisive importance for the further course of our argument.

3. In the last 'Roman' Ode of Horace we meet the brief and pregnant phrase: 'In bowing to the gods, thou art lord' (c. 3, 6, 5). Directed to the 'Roman', it emphasizes the intimate and causal connexion between lordship and an obedience to the divine will. We must extract its actual meaning from the examples by which Horace illustrates the opposite attitude.

When he says that the sins of the fathers are visited on the children so long as the temples and images of the gods are not restored, the demand for such a restoration includes in itself the divine will. But the divine will is not only revealed

there. The neglect of the gods has cost Italy much woe—so we hear in the verse that we quoted in starting. Such ‘neglect’ has as its opposite on the positive side an idea that lies in the centre of Roman thought—the idea of *religio*. By that word, which in its very etymology contains the contrast to ‘neglect’, the Romans denote the ‘paying heed’ to all that the gods may demand of men. And that is what Horace means when he bids his people bow to the gods. In *religio*, then, is included the foundation of the Roman lordship.

But the demands of the gods—and this is the second decisive point—are made known to men by authoritative indications. To these he has to attend; these he must put into execution. That is why Horace, when he calls men to give back to the gods their honours, turns in solemn form, reminiscent of divine oracles, to his fellow-citizens.¹¹ He himself speaks the word of destiny and by this word fixes destiny; it is as seer and prophet, as *vates*, that the poet here comes before his people.

We may compare with this the oracle from Delphi, which Livy makes the Romans seek before the conquest of Veii (5, 16, 9 f.). Among other things (more important at the time, but less significant for our context) stands the demand that they should restore in the old style traditional cults, the practice of which had been intermitted (5, 16, 11); here again this is a condition of success. Again we find an authoritative pronouncement, this time from the lips of the god; the warning to the ‘Roman’, which introduces the oracle, is linked to the form of speech which Horace and Virgil under like conditions selected.

But *religio*, of which we are again reminded in this case, is not exhausted by demands for cult. Again we have a piece of evidence available—evidence which has already been noted in its intimate connexion with the words of Horace.

The speech in which Livy makes Camillus warn his people against abandoning the city destroyed by the Gauls (5, 51, 1 f.) is entirely based on the idea of *religio*. *Religio* again enters into close relation with the well-being and greatness of Rome. One has only to look at the course of the last years, so we are told, to recognize that all went well for the

Romans as long as they followed the gods (5, 51, 5), but that this was reversed as soon as they ceased to heed them. Among the examples which Livy makes his hero adduce to illustrate the contrast between the 'heeding of the gods' and the 'neglect' of them (5, 51, 7-8; cp. 52, 1), appear some drawn from cult in the narrower sense. But there are others beside them.

At the very beginning stand two examples of quite another kind; the hostile Veii was conquered, we hear, because attention was paid to the warning of the gods, but the Gallic catastrophe was incurred because heed was not paid to the divine voice that announced the approach of the foe (5, 51, 6-7). The view underlying this may be outlined in the statement that the Romans should be directed in their actions by divine guidance and, further, that *religio* includes the demand to listen to such indications. It was because men neglected to heed the voice that rang out by night, clearer than any voice of man, below the Palatine (5, 32, 6) that the disaster took its course.

Once again it is plain that the voice, in speaking, fixes *fatum*. The voice it is that sets the ball of destiny rolling—this is shown by the form of narration that Livy has chosen. Then follows the banishment of Camillus from city and home; the removal of the one man who might have checked them opens the way to the Gauls (5, 32, 7; 33, 1). It is not till now that we hear of their migration; at once the avalanche begins to move before our eyes. Then follows an offence against the law of nations by the Roman envoys at a moment when, as Livy says, *fatum* already lay heavy on Rome (5, 36, 6). And now we go one step farther; although the whole scope of the disaster is already revealed (5, 37, 1), only quite insufficient precautions are taken against the foe. The end comes with the approach of the divine vengeance—the defeat on the Allia and the destruction of the city.

What is thus unrolled before our eyes is such a pageant as no history other than the Roman could unfold. The overwhelming onmarch of *fatum*—*fatum* itself communicated and fixed by the prophetic speech—these are the structural elements of the picture. But the rôle of the Roman is

determined by his 'attention' to such indications or by his 'neglect'; in case of neglect he hurls himself into the abyss; that is the meaning of the Gallic catastrophe. But if he pays heed, he carries out what is predetermined; he becomes the instrument of *fatum*. Thus Veii was conquered and thus, too, will the restoration of Rome ensue. The indications which proclaim the will of *fatum* have already once brought victory, and they will continue so to do so often as the Roman heeds them. They will, we may conclude, bring him in the end to world-Empire.

The Aeneas of Virgil was led to Latium by the oracles and advices of the gods which fixed his destiny,¹² and the same powers stand beside his descendants, to accompany them in their actions and their progress. Roman history in its whole course is attended by the oracles of the Sibyl and by the wonders which lead to their consultation, as also by the consultations of the Etruscan haruspices; they continuously keep the people informed about its relation to those powers that determine *fatum*. They guide each of Rome's steps, for they offer authoritative indications of what has in each case to be done or left undone.

Because the Romans for their part carry out the biddings they thus receive, because they 'follow the gods' (Livy, 5, 51, 5), they are the lords of the world. This is the proper and deepest sense of that phrase of Horace that we set at the beginning of this chapter.

4. We must now try to draw the conclusions which should be drawn. It might appear as if all that we have in the way of utterances of Roman poets and historians has no very serious importance. All these utterances belong, it seems, to the age of Augustus, a single narrow and comparatively late period. But it would be easy enough to extend their circle beyond these limits. Cicero, who also may well be heard, can count on full understanding and consent from his audience when he makes the gods prophecy by their signs the coming conspiracy of Cataline, and take a decisive part in its suppression (*In Cat.* 8, 18-22). Again, at a much later date, Celsus does not hesitate to assume that the gods have created the Roman Empire (*ἀλ. λόγ.* 8, 69), and Augustine was at sore pains to refute this view with the necessary emphasis.

But there remains another objection that might be brought. We might call to mind that the actual consciousness of mission, which characterizes the Augustan age, only appears at a moment when the necessary conditions of world-rule were not merely prepared, but assured. On the other hand, we might consider whether in that age what had already been alive, though unconscious, was not merely raised to consciousness. When we have done this, we shall not find it easy simply to shelve the evidence of the age of Augustus, which, after all, reflected as hardly any other age did on the fundamental facts of Roman character. Above all, the question whether a principle of explanation is of value or not is never to be decided by preconceived considerations, but only from the actual circumstances themselves.

To take one point before others, so much is plain, that cult, the kernel of Roman religion, has a far wider importance for state and politics than has generally been supposed. The careful and unremitting worship of the gods will in that case have been the necessary condition for the rise and rule of Rome. That this was actually the view of the Romans has already been shown in one particular case. We were able to demonstrate in impressive style what importance the foundations of temples had in the course of Roman history.¹⁸ But we have not reached the full scope of our conception. We must endeavour to pay attention to other such contexts—and more careful attention than has hitherto been paid. The idea that it is the gods who fix the destiny of Rome and therewith hold it in their hands appears everywhere in unmistakable form.

Let us take one example. It seems to be characteristic of the popular ideas of earliest Rome, that each state was regarded as a world of law by itself, as something independent and inviolable: it was not enmity and war, but peaceful intercourse between the single communities, that formed the norm of international relations. It is not so much this idea in itself as the reasons that have been found for it¹⁴ that were bound to raise doubts. The solemn form of speech, in which the *pater patratus* opens the procedure of declaration of war, is delivered within the enemy's country, it is true, but it is not at once directed to the future antagonist. It

is not in face of him that one will establish one's cause as just, but before the gods. Therefore one turns to Jupiter, to the boundaries of the neighbouring land, personified and conceived of as divine, to the sacred law (*fas*), which again is conceived of as a deity; with the strangest oaths the priest affirms the truth of his contention (Livy 1, 32, 6 f.). And once again Jupiter, then Janus Quirinus and all the gods, are invoked in order to demonstrate to them the injustice of the hostile attitude (*loc. cit.* 10). It is only after one has thus both bound and purified oneself in the presence of the powers, who watch over all events and who alone are able to help one to a favourable issue, that the 'just war' can be opened (*loc. cit.* 12).

There is no trace here of international law in our sense. It is the gods who are the contracting parties in the process of law that is played out before our eyes. We find something similar in a second case. There has been talk of a religious hallowing for the Roman conception of empire, expressed in specially brilliant form in the triumph. It was less in honour of the victorious general than of the supreme god, Jupiter, that that spectacle was developed.¹⁵ But there is really no question of any 'hallowing' or of any 'spectacle' or of anything added as some sort of adornment to the actual event. What the triumph expresses is the actual event in its real content. It is not that Jupiter has brought and achieved the triumph; he himself is the victor; it is not to honour him that the triumph is celebrated, but he himself triumphs. That is why the triumpher moves along in the garb of the god, and why the identification rises to the pitch of compelling the triumpher to colour his face with vermillion, in order by the red colour of his skin to resemble down to the last detail the archaic image of Jupiter.¹⁶ Just as Roman politics in general, if they are really Roman, denote no more than the execution of a divine command, so too is the victorious general an instrument in the hand of the god. That is why he retires behind the god as the true victor, and passes entirely over into that other and greater power that directs the actions of the Roman people and of their general with the rest.

There is no need to multiply examples; what we have

already adduced will be sufficient. We shall hardly wish to require our modern historian to realize completely for himself a belief in the Roman gods, although, indeed, many and not the worst of them have emphatically raised some such demand. But we may expect of him that he should take the actual beliefs of the Romans seriously and should grasp them in their peculiar quality and in their decisive influence on Roman conduct, instead of trying to approximate them as closely as possible to what may appear most tolerable to our modern understanding.

We may add as a second demand, that not only ceremonies of cult, but also all those divine indications, those pronouncements and consultations of the divine will to which we have referred, shall be understood in their significance for the state and history of Rome. All these things, wonders and signs, oracles and haruspicy, observations of the heavens and of the flight of birds, pervade the whole of the public life of Rome. By fixing or proclaiming *fatum*, they mark the foundation of public security and public well-being. But we have grown accustomed to regarding them as at best an inconvenience for our modern sentiment.

The attitude of Mommsen, above all others, has proved determinant in this respect. Setting out from the symptoms of decay in the late Republic, he was disposed to regard augury and the like from the angle of the ridiculous. This tendency, in a weakened form, is still operative to-day. The interest of Tacitus in wonders and prodigies is a vital part of his general view of history, which is very largely determined by *fatum* and fatalism. But instead of recognizing this fact, that he is here simply the successor to the position taken up by the Annalists, Livy and the national epic, it has been supposed that such a curious interest can only be explained by the membership of Tacitus in the college of the *quindecimviri*, which had to control the sacrifices and oracles.¹⁷ The effect was simply mistaken for the cause.

How strongly, how decisively, the divine indications intervened in Roman life can be better grasped at one point than at any other—from the attitude of single persons, particularly persons of the highest rank. Here again we find gathered

together as in a focus what really determines Roman character.

Suetonius records of Augustus (c. 90-2) a series of detailed traits] which, to judge from their peculiarity and exactness, go back to sure sources of knowledge. We hear with astonishment of the Emperor's dread of thunder-storms, of apparitions that haunted him, particularly in the spring, of dreams, to the warnings of which he paid heed. To augury he paid close attention, and his care went so far, that if in the morning he had accidentally drawn on the wrong shoe first, he regarded it as a sign of ill-omen. We can add other details—for example, the story that to us seems almost comic, of the peasant Eutychus and his ass Nikon.¹⁸ Augustus met them on the morning of the battle of Actium, and that was ground enough for this true Roman to set up bronze statues of the two, man and beast, as bearers of fortunate names and prophets of the victory.

There is not, however, the slightest reason for doubting the seriousness and importance of these tales, at least for Augustus himself. This man, from whose portraits one may sometimes fancy that a superior and chilling rationalism is flowing, was a Roman, like the rest. He was a Roman who observed in and about him the work of *fatum*, and was carefully prepared to neglect no indication that might bring him tidings of this *fatum*.

Perhaps even more remarkable in such respects is Sulla; in this, as in other points, he was the true predecessor of Augustus. Reports of the signs which were vouchsafed him run through the biography of Plutarch like a red thread. There is no doubt that the information on such points went back to Sulla himself. In the 'Memorabilia' that he left behind him he did not disdain to recount them. He felt himself to be under the guidance and protection of the gods, who by continuous warnings taught him what he had to do. It is in this sense that we have to understand his saying that he valued 'luck' higher than human capacity. He once said clearly what he meant by those words; 'luck' for him was to carry out what the god had ordered.

There is altogether something very curious about this luck of Sulla. From the words of Plutarch it might seem as if

it meant the power that the Greeks named Tyche, that mighty but ever capricious goddess who, according to her mysterious law, now gives, now denies success, who raises up to-day to hurl down to-morrow. But Plutarch himself observes, and other witnesses confirm it, that the *cognomen* of *Felix*, which Sulla assumed, to judge from its translation in Greek ('Επαφρόδιτος), did certainly not mean favourite of fortune.¹⁹ It expressed the thought that its bearer was under the protection and in the grace of a definite goddess, Aphrodite (Plutarch, *Sulla* 34, 4). Even the Latin word has nothing to say about its bearer enjoying the sudden and unexpected gifts of Tyche. It denotes rather what is fruitful and creative, what always or on definite occasions stands under the protection of the gods, that is to say, not so much the momentarily as the permanently happy.²⁰ Here again the whole idea merges in that idea which we have recognized as the specifically Roman view.

The last who must be named in this context is the elder Scipio.²¹ Even in his lifetime he was wrapped in something very like myth. Among many other wonders, we hear that he never entered on an undertaking without spending some time in the temple of Jupiter of the Capitol and seeking his counsel. In general, it was believed of him that he knew the future and always acted on the instructions of the gods. What this implies is clear enough. Through his intercourse with the supreme god, Scipio gains an insight into the course of *fatum*, which is, after all, simply what has been 'said' by Jupiter and thereby unalterably determined. Or, to use another form of words, this course, which the Romans can actually define as 'Jupiter's *fatum*', is fixed by the god when he communicates it to Scipio by word of mouth. What constitutes the special greatness of this Roman is that he pays heed to it and therefore knows all the prophecies and destinies that flow from the divine lips. As Scipio accomplishes, as he merely executes what *fatum* wills and bids him do, he becomes the instrument of Jupiter's planning. He becomes one of the master-craftsmen who fashioned the greatness of Rome.

5. It constitutes the character of the great man, that he is gripped by what is to come to pass in an incomparably

deeper sense than his contemporaries. In particular, it marks the great man of action, that in his action he is determined not by momentary and personal concerns, but by such an anticipation of what he realizes as coming to pass. Scipio, in that he knows the *fatum* and acts according to it, does what will in any case be done, what must come to pass.

The actions of Scipio, then, are simply a model of the actions of Rome herself. What, in the Roman view at least, gave Scipio the victory—above all, the victory over Hannibal—was the same thing that gave the Romans as a whole their drive and irresistible power. It was the consciousness of being the forerunners of *fatum* and thus the builders of an order and an Empire, the creation of which had been willed by the gods themselves.

This consciousness of the Romans, as we have now seen it in records, institutions, and in the great individual personality, includes two elements. In the first place is revealed an almost humble attitude to one's own actions and one's own history, since one knows that one is only the tool, the gods are the masters. In three things, to quote the words of Cicero (*de har. resp.* 19), have the Romans excelled all other peoples—in their piety, in their 'attentiveness' to the gods, and in their special realization of the fact that these direct the universe by their working. But, on the other hand, the consciousness of being an instrument involves the consciousness of being the bearer of a historical mission. This it is that raises the Romans to a singular elect station. By submitting to the gods they became masters of the world.

Is this result at which we have arrived, in contrast to views previously held, really incredible? Hardly so, we think. It would be a fascinating theme to ask of the great imperial foundations of history whether among their 'causes' there have not been some of a similar character to those that we have established for the Roman Empire. We must confine our inquiry to a single example. From the number of possible examples we select one which lies far enough from the Roman to make an objective view possible, but which, on the other hand, stands before our eyes as immediately present and therefore easy to contemplate. What we have in mind is the British World Empire.

We must, however, begin by removing one obvious misunderstanding. It is not our intention to characterize the English people as 'modern Romans'. Such assertions, often as they are made both in professional and unprofessional quarters, are, in this form at least, misleading and even dangerous. We should need a thorough examination of the general problem of the comparability of distinct historical sequences before we could detach the element of truth that is perhaps contained in that assertion. Enough that we have here a possibility of comparison, or, to express ourselves more cautiously, a remarkable likeness within a clearly defined sphere—but no more than a similarity, if only for the reason that in the one case we have to do with a system of thought determined by Christianity, in the other with ancient humanity and ancient mentality.

Caution is thus from the first imposed on us. Our readers must understand us, then, if we practise restraint in the form of our narrative. It will be enough to pass briefly in review what is generally known or assumed as known; further progress and reflection, maybe further restrictions, too, may be left to the initiative of our readers.

The English system of political thought was born of Puritanism, of the belief that one was a peculiar people and had therefore a special position before God and in the world as well. This original attitude has long since been abandoned, but, in a secularized and therefore unconscious form, it is still alive in many quarters. It is seen, perhaps, most characteristically in the 'splendid isolation', which expresses not merely the attitude of a particular moment in history, but a generally decisive factor in English policy. But the idea of a mission is also determinative. England, like Rome, has her task to fulfil, assigned to her by the divine plan of history. This 'manifest destiny', which includes a responsibility both to God and to the world, demands that, when the occasion arises, she has to serve the welfare of the world and the welfare of her neighbour by establishing her own rule, where the other party cannot see, for the time at least, the necessity. This is the point at which the 'manifest destiny' was bound to merge of necessity in the conception of the 'imperial destiny'.

Besides the resemblance in this main point, let us indicate a few further similarities. We have just spoken of 'splendid isolation' as one of the main incentives of English policy. In Rome we find the same attitude again, and again we find it anchored to the sphere of religion.

In the first place, we find the isolation of Rome at an early date, for Rome, though of Latin origin, never reckoned herself among the Latins.²² But even later the Romans remained an 'isolated people'; we see Rome as no mere member of a political system. There was no community between her and the other peoples. The alliances which she granted them always brought her a sort of external independence. She was a mighty, self-concentrated power, ever extending further.

Hegel, from whom these observations are derived,²³ has already pointed out that the same characteristics appear in the primitive legendary history of Rome. This city, founded surely by the sons of gods, is yet pictured as a community of outcasts, with whom none of their neighbours will have anything to do. It was present in the consciousness of the Romans themselves, that their ancestors had from the first set themselves in opposition to all their neighbours.²⁴ Here we are in the realm of myth, that is to say, of religion, too; it is remarkable enough that even there the special position of Rome should have found its expression. The foundation of the city of Rome by divine command and by the offspring of a god anticipated what was to be fulfilled in the historical fortunes of Rome.

Yet one more point of agreement may be mentioned; and this time we begin with Rome. It has been boasted of Rome that in continuous advances she drew in to herself the territories adjacent to her advancing boundaries 'by dint of long and stubborn labour'.²⁵ I am not sure that we are not simplifying the problem too much when we introduce the word 'labour', whether we are not regarding it in too didactic a manner. Rome slips, under this point of view, into the position of an ambitious young man who is never weary of exerting himself to accomplish the task set him to the satisfaction of those who have to judge him—in this case the modern historians.

Against this view we must emphasize the fact that the Romans were no less strong in their power of patient waiting than in their advance; their policy in face of the Hellenistic East is a striking example of this. They possessed the relaxation of the truly great, who can wait until the hour comes, who knows that the will of destiny is behind him and that certain things must some day fall to his share. Finally, the Romans had the special insight into the conditioned and limited nature of all human activity in an extraordinary measure; they were assured that by your own efforts, be they as zealous as they may, you can only contribute in the slightest degree to the event. It was because he knew the transitoriness of even the greatest things that the tears of the younger Scipio flowed at the sight of the destruction of Carthage.²⁶ The same man, as censor in the year 141 B.C., made an alteration in the prayer at the *lustratio*; it was no longer the increase of Rome, but the maintenance of what she had already attained, that should be asked of the gods (Valerius Maximus 4, 1, 10).

In this point we again strike a remarkable similarity to the thought of that people which we have chosen to compare with Rome. A wise patience has often brought English policy its finest victories. Slowly it lets events ripen until the time has come that demands interference. That is why many of its gains look more like accident than conquest; if we were to believe the historian Secley, the expansion of England would have taken place almost 'in a fit of absence of mind'. But the 'manifest destiny' finds its expression once again in the fact that the inner logic of facts is allowed to work until sooner or later it makes its way.

Here is revealed also a deep insight into the strict conditions of the historical position and its unalterable laws; this has always been a peculiarity of English policy. Thus these same conquerors have also been the ones who understand how to renounce on the grand scale when need is. They recognize a boundary which is not to be passed by any human effort. Thus, writes one of the best authorities on Anglo-Saxon character, 'the greatest statesmen have also been the most humble, and in this an Abraham Lincoln and a Bismarck are in perfect agreement despite all their other

dissimilarities; we think that we are pushing, but really we are pushed.'

In this, again, we see a variation of the conception which Horace, albeit in incomparably nobler form, expressed in his words about the root-cause of the rule and greatness of Rome.

Chapter II

THE FIRST TWO CENTURIES OF THE EMPIRE

IN the foregoing chapter we summarized the points that give Roman religion, when looked at in its relation to Roman history, its importance. It was not without intention that we placed this summary at a place where in the Augustan epoch, and particularly in religion, a summit can be marked. From now on begins a decline, gradual at first, but, when regarded as a whole, unmistakable. Whilst we once more passed in review all that could be said on the theme of the importance of Roman religion in the history of the world and of the human soul, we at the same time were saying good-bye to the great age of that religion.

Before we enter into details about the Empire we must find room for one general observation. We have already emphasized in our introduction that the history of Roman religion is not yet ripe for narration in the pregnant sense; this assertion is especially true of the late period. We shall not indeed be wrong if we describe the religion of the Roman Empire as a field on which research for some considerable time has been spending itself with peculiar avidity. The end of the ancient world means for it an event of universal importance—an importance universally recognized—and, in view of the high significance of the religious changes in this context, some reflection of it on the history of religion proper was bound to follow. But this preoccupation of research has been disadvantageous rather than the reverse of the particular circle of problems with which we have to do. We find at least that the subject, which a history of Roman religion in the post-Augustan age has to handle, has not been decided with sufficient clearness. The essentially distinct complexes of questions that belong to a history of religion in the Roman Empire or to a history of Roman religion in that age

keep on passing more and more over into one another, until the danger of a complete obliteration of barriers is imminent.

For one epoch of historical research, not long since past, the idea of understanding was a central one. The aim that it set before itself was the interpretation of human conduct in the single case, so far as it could be derived from such understanding. The effort was accordingly made to grasp historical events in every case in their motives and the special quality that that implies, and to make those motives clear by entering with loving care into all expressions of them. Such an approach to the subject, that was more concerned with the individual element in all its gradations and interruptions than in the recognition of general principles and sharply defined outlines, was bound to turn with special eagerness to such times as in one sense or other represented a crisis or turning-point of fate. Wherever an old system is in process of vanishing and a new one is preparing its way to take up the inheritance, a maximum of individual characteristics may be trusted to show itself. It is not a single idea or even a group of similar ideas that gives such ages their stamp, but in them two worlds fight one against the other. They are presented to the onlooker in the most diverse stages of opposition, of parallelism, of mutual union and interpenetration.

In the late age of the ancient world the declining antiquity and the rising Middle Age, the old and the new religions confront one another. What most attracted Usener to undertake his research on the origin of the Christmas festival was its special character as a point of junction between two contrasted worlds.¹ But nowadays a third element has been added to this duality by the discovery that the influence of the East, of Iran above all, was of decisive importance for the end of the ancient world. Through the astounding finds in Eastern Turkestan,² with their almost unbelievable blend of cultures and nationalities, the religion of the Manicheans, first and foremost, has been presented with fresh clearness before our eyes.³ Greek spiritual values and Oriental tradition have here undergone a remarkable union ; ⁴ the influence, even on the West, has been a mighty one. Moreover, the Mandeian tradition has steadily been winning

in importance,⁶ and in the last few years has actually become the centre of discussion for the history of religion.⁶ With this, an incalculable wealth of new questions seemed to rise. Just as in the history of art the citation of Eastern monuments produced the conception of a Rome or a Hellenism in the embrace of the East,⁷ so have F. Cumont and R. Reitzenstein tried to make Orientalism the base of the whole religion of the Empire. In every part, we are told, it penetrated the ancient world, and the two researchers have never wearied of illustrating the process in all the contrast and interplay of the various component forces.⁸

The result is that all these phenomena to-day are more or less emphatically claiming a place in the religious history of declining Rome. We are thus led to extend the scope of our inquiry to an almost incredible degree. In pursuing the wealth of historical phenomena into their last gradations, in seeking to understand how Rome crossed and intertwined with Hellenism and the two of them with the Orient, we had been led, without realizing it, to the bounds of the Empire and even beyond them. A world, in its very essence alien to Rome, seemed to have assured for itself a place in the history of Roman religion.

In contrast to this, we wish to champion another point of view. It does not abandon itself at once to the variety of events, but seeks rather in history the element of shape and form, in order thus to grasp it in its special quality. It sets out from the thought, in which our modern efforts after a new concept of history culminate—the thought that an inner unity between systematic knowledge and history must be possible to demonstrate; but it does not apprehend history as a stream of events almost literally flowing past us, but as a revelation in time, a manifestation of formal types that in principle always exist. From the beginning they exist as possibilities, in history they come to expression in definite sequence, determined by their nature. In harmony with this thought, our main effort will be to detach from the course of historical events certain unitary systems—systems which will in every case represent a form as a whole, intelligible in itself, and which will be recognized as spiritual creations from their proper laws.

One such spiritual whole is Roman religion. The dialectic process, which caused it to develop alongside its Greek model, has been traced up to the point where it reached its classical perfection—the perfection that was pre-ordained and designed by history for it. This consummate expression of the possibilities resident in Roman religion falls in the Augustan age and thus coincides in time with the climax of Roman history in general. It is marked by a deliberate return to the great creations of Greek and native Roman belief, but also by a clear and decided rejection of all Oriental influences. In the sequel it may be that the religions of the East nathless force their way in and determine ever increasingly the look of the following centuries; in no direction would we dispute the scope of that process. But to the student, who is trying to grasp Roman religion as a spiritual form in its appearance in time and place, the process can only be understood as a foreign invasion, as a declension from its truest nature. It cannot therefore be the task of our present work to include everything that tries to force a passage into the Roman sphere and undermine its true character; it is that character itself that must form our main theme, and only in so far as and as long as it remained intact.

We must make the attempt not to regard Roman religion, in its latest phases, as a name to include the most diverse elements, but to give here, as before, the history of a clearly defined spiritual phenomenon, capable of detachment from the world around it by its definition and its individual system of laws. Or, to put it in other words, we must try to write a history of Roman religion during the age of Orientalism, not, as has so often been done, the opposite, a history of that Orientalism during the decline of Roman religion.

We are encouraged to give such emphasis to the Roman element under the Empire by an unprejudiced examination of the facts of religion in themselves. One example must suffice. It denotes a mighty advance beyond Mommsen's purely legal method of approach, that A. Alföldi, in his researches on the monarchical ceremonial and on the insignia and costume of the Emperors,⁹ should have called our

attention to the strongly religious factors that are revealed in them. Of especial importance in this connexion is the fact that, despite all Hellenistic or even Oriental forms that have found their way into the symbolism of the Emperors, it has become manifest that it is strongly rooted in the strictly Roman world of ideas. In the case of the very borrowings it has been shown that they were only able to set foot in Rome because hints of something similar were already present there; it was these Roman elements that formed a point of crystallization for all that was subsequently borrowed from Hellenistic monarchy. M. P. Charlesworth,¹⁰ following Alföldi, has recently tried to develop this thought. Again it has appeared that much that at first sight seemed to be purely Eastern had already its roots in the Roman world.

In pointing to the final developments of imperial ceremonial, not to say the final victory of the Oriental religions, this introductory discussion has outrun the historical narrative proper. As our next task, we must take the treatment of the period stretching from the successors of Augustus to the end of the Antonines and the beginning of the Severi. For the history of religion it represents in essentials a unity.

If we ask wherein this unity consists, we reach the first fundamental result—that, in contrast to the age of Augustus, a certain settlement of religious forms as such takes place. Not that there is any question as yet of fossilization—on quite general grounds such a process, so soon after the climax of development, would be sufficiently unlikely. But we do find an unmistakable crippling of the creative forces, even if we can still trace on every hand a relative process of creation, dependent on existing forms and penetrated by them.

The peculiarity of the Augustan age depended on the accession to the revival of the religious past of a new and very present element; in the historical greatness of the Emperor the divine seemed to manifest itself for his contemporaries. That therein lay a genuine and spontaneous expression of religious sentiment we have already laboured to prove. A Seneca could still give utterance to the feeling that underlies it: (*de clem.* 1, 10, 3 f.) ‘We do not believe that Augustus is a god simply because we have been ordered

to' (*deum esse non tamquam iussi credimus*). He goes on to explain this in the direction of the special subject of his essay: 'We acknowledge that Augustus was a noble prince and that the name of father suited him well, for no other reason than this, that he did not cruelly persecute any slights put upon him, to which princes are usually as sensitive as to actual wrong, that he laughed away any abuse directed against him, that it was obvious that it was a punishment for him to have to punish, that far from having the death-sentence executed on those whom he had to condemn for adultery with his daughter, he actually, in banishing them, equipped them with letters of protection and escort'.¹¹

To this reverence for the great personality was added the fact that in the *vates* arose a seer and prophet, who raised into consciousness that general but vague and uncertain feeling. This combination of genuinely creative forces, this contrast of *princeps* and poet, was a unique and un-recurring event. The age that immediately followed found things at once changed. No other poet seriously dared to lay claim to the position of a Horace or a Virgil. And in keeping with this, the veneration of the Emperor was no longer understood as the expression of the effect of a unique and personal greatness, but was applied to the institution of the principate as such. Even so, however, there was a mighty development of this branch of Roman religion.

It is in a mass of detailed forms and religious creations that the imperial cult now begins to express itself. It assimilates much of what was present in other forms of religion in order to bring it into some sort of relation to itself, and therewith find glory and adornment. We cannot mistake the prevailing endeavour to push into the forefront those sides of religion that reflect in one way or another the greatness and divinely purposed importance of the Empire as a central fact.¹²

On the path, once opened by the creation of a Pax Augusta, further progress was deliberately made. Not only did the cult of that goddess receive a far more brilliant site than before on the forum of Vespasian, but a series of other personifications were characterized by appropriate descriptions as blessings issuing from the Emperor; *Clementia Caesaris*,

Providentia Augusta, Pietas Augusta, Iustitia Augusta, etc.¹³ In Rome itself one did not proceed to identify, as in the provinces, the members of the imperial house with older deities, and to devote cult to them as Ζεύς Ἐλευθέριος or as νέος Διώνυσος, as νέα Ἥρα or as νέα Ἀφροδίτη. But when on the two reliefs of the architrave of the Arch of Beneventum¹⁴ Jupiter is represented, in the company of Juno and Minerva, handing over to Trajan the thunderbolt as the symbol of his might, the Emperor is thereby marked out as the vicegerent of God on earth.

It would be perverse to suppose that the turning from the worship of a single great personality to the glorification of the Empire as such necessarily implied an externalization and a decline of religious forces. We are entitled rather to assume that what happened was a shifting of emphasis, conditioned by actual political circumstances. In giving expression to this change the state-religion proved that it carried a genuine content and was therefore a religion indeed. All the emotions that could move the age, the sense of the greatness of the Empire and the culture that it represented, the care for its maintenance in face of its foes, North and South, the hopes of a final triumph—all these were incorporated in the institution of the Empire.

In view of these facts it was inevitable that the imperial cult, even as the Empire itself became the political and ideal centre of the whole Empire, should gradually obtain a mighty importance within the religion of the state. And this was naturally bound to happen at the expense of the other gods.¹⁵ All of them were bound to fall behind the new worship; even the newly created gods of the imperial house, Mars Ultor and Apollo of the Palatine, did not escape the common fate. It was only the Capitoline Triad that really maintained its place; under the Flavian Emperors (foundation of the Agon Capitolinus by Domitian, 86 B.C.: Suetonius, *Domit.* 4, 4) and under Trajan they were with deliberate emphasis again made the dominant deities of Empire and army.¹⁶

The vigour with which the imperial cult pressed on all others has been happily observed from the protocols, preserved in inscriptions, of the Arval Brethren,¹⁷ a priestly society restored by Augustus. I cannot do better than quote

the words of Wissowa.¹⁸ 'With the exception of the announcement and celebration of the annually recurring main festival of the Dea Dia (the original chief goddess of the Brethren), and of the expiatory sacrifices, called for by exceptional occurrences, the whole activity of the priesthood is practically entirely taken up with religious demonstrations of loyalty; apart from the general *vota* for the welfare of the imperial house, on the third of January we meet with similar regular yearly *vota* for each year of a reign, and, further, with vows at the illness of the Emperor or the accouchement of the Empress, at the departure of the Emperor on a campaign or at his triumphal return; finally, in the first period, before the Flavian Emperors removed this celebration from the agenda of the Arval Brethren, sacrifices on all days connected with the personal history of the reigning Emperor and his family.' To show how much this whole class of religious offices represented a novelty as against the traditional service, he continues: 'The deities invoked in these acts are completely different from those who came into action at the old yearly festival and at the expiatory sacrifices; even the Dea Dia, to whom the whole service of the priesthood was dedicated, only appears in the very early period—behind the Capitoline Triad—at the New Year vows; all that is accomplished thereafter are acts of loyalty, without the merest mention of the true owner of the cult.'

We must renounce the attempt to pursue this development in other contexts, as, for example, the dedicatory inscriptions of the city of Rome or the imperial coins.¹⁹ Here we will only touch briefly on that most remarkable course of development that can be grasped as a transition from the former worship under set forms to a fixed and permanent institution. The garb of the triumpher, originally worn by the victor and only on a single day, is next given to the single Emperor as a permanent distinction, to end by becoming a traditional festival costume for the Emperor.²⁰ So, too, the triumphal car becomes a regular piece of furniture for the imperial ceremonial procession.²¹ Alföldi has proved in many other cases the transformation and fixation of original forms, most palpably, perhaps, in the case of the acclamations

which were offered to the Emperor.²² Under Augustus we still see the sentiment of the senate and people finding expression in a free and spontaneous manner. In the sequel, this free style, dependent on the moment, passes over into a fixed form of acclamation, which becomes customary on definite occasions—at the games or in the senate-house. In the senate, above all, it came about that these exactly regulated acclamations gradually ousted the original forms under which that body expressed its will, and gave expression instead to the unconditional subjection to the fatal and divine will of the ruler. With unusual clarity we can see in them the great change which leads from the free revelation of personality to the prescribed and formal collective demonstration.²³

From this point we turn to a second course of events, in which we can observe a crystallization of religious forms. Though not less in importance than the last, this course of events has, it seems to me, never yet been brought out with the emphasis that is its due.

In the Augustan age what seemed unattainable was attained; the Roman people were won again for the traditional beliefs. It is not the sentiments of an isolated class, but the feelings of the whole community, that find their expression in the words of the *vates*. If Augustus ordained that the state-priesthoods should only be open to senators and knights, there was no intention of restriction to special ranks of society, but it seemed suitable to the majesty of the gods that the noblest and best should devote themselves to their service.

In the sequel, however, the institution as such came more strongly to the fore. The institution once again replaced what had first been the expression and tangible form of a spontaneous emotion. After the voice of the *vates* had fallen dumb, there remained only the two upper classes, the senators, above all, as bearers of the state-cult. This was based on the ordinance, made once and for all, whereby not only the primitive companies of the *Fetiales*, *Salii*, *Titii* and *Arval Brethren*, but also the four great priestly colleges (*Pontifices*, *Augurs*, *Quindecimviri* and *Epulones*), were restricted to them. To these were added—a fact of importance in this

age—the closely associated *sodalitates* of the *Divi imperatores*; they, too, were in the possession of the senatorial order.

It was thus a noble and exclusive class, in whose hands the destinies of the state religion were placed henceforward. To the *sodales Augustales*, about the membership of which we are well informed both by literary evidence (Tacitus, *Ann.* I, 54; Suetonius, *Claudius* 6, 2) and by inscriptional (CIL. 6, 1984 f. = 14, 2388 f.), belonged the *primores civitatis*, and, above them, the Emperor Tiberius with the princes, Drusus, Claudius and Germanicus. Or we may take an example from the Arval Acts; on the 29th of May in the year 88 there was assembled round the Emperor Gaius an illustrious circle, in which appear a Furius Camillus, a Paullus Fabius Persicus and scions of the Iunii Silani, the Domitii Ahenobarbi and Calpurnii Pisones. All of these belonged to the oldest aristocracy of Rome; the ancestors of all had played important parts in the history of the city. It does not affect our judgement that in the last three cases we have to do with representatives of houses originally plebian.²⁴

Let us take yet one case more. At the Secular Festival of Augustus there were twenty-seven chosen *pueri patrimi et matrimi* and as many girls, who performed the hymn of Horace. At the repetition of the celebration under Septimus Severus, in the year 204, the same number appears, but the boys are now described as *pueri senatores*; their names are individually recorded—among the *pueri senatores* appearing two of the order of knights.²⁵ I do not know if things were very different in the first case; there, too, the choice of the chorus will have been made from the noblest families. But the class-factor was not emphasized; it was enough to know that it was the best who were suited to the act of worship. At the later festival, however, this motif of origin comes strongly to the fore; the demand that they should be *patrimi* and *matrimi* seems even to have been pushed into the background.

This special social stratification is a second factor of the highest importance; together with that stiffening of religious forms of which we have spoken, it characterizes the peculiarity of the state-cult of Rome in this age. We may even say

that the destiny of that cult lay bound up with this restriction to the Imperial house and senate. This it is that henceforth gives the religion of Rome its special character; on it rests its dignity and, if we care to use the phrase, its specific greatness. But in this very restriction we have to look for the germ of its decay, even if that decay, when it came, was not without a grandeur of its own.

It is not yet time to cast our eyes on the end. First we have to follow out the effects of the conditions that we have described on the religion of the state.

Once already—towards the close of the republic, from about the beginning of the second century B.C. the senate and nobility had consciously made themselves the bearers of the religion of Rome. This was at a time when they still kept their rule unbroken in their hands. As the conservative force in general, they undertook the protection of the Roman gods against the foreign element which threatened to endanger their existence and, with it, that of the state. Like every closed aristocratic society, this Roman aristocracy directed its most earnest attention to the preservation of traditional principles. Now, under the principate and by its aid, the senatorial nobility came once again into the possession of its former function. Just as the Emperor laid stress on ranking as the protector of the inherited religion, and, on the model of Augustus, as restorer of the temples,²⁸ so was the senate to be the guardian and bearer of this order.

This endeavour was assisted by a special favour of circumstances. In the age of Augustus Roman religion had attained its classical form. To preserve it and to secure for it in the times that were to come its authority as one of the principle norms of Roman being was bound to be recognized by Emperor and ruling class alike as their task in religion and politics.

As starting-point for our following discussion we may be allowed to enter briefly into the question of what importance attaches as a factor in history to such an attainment of classical form. It seems to presuppose two things. First, as we have already suggested, that the possibilities resident in a particular phenomenon have been brought to perfect

development—a process of creation, that is to say. But as every creation demands an echo, an effect on its surroundings, if it is to fulfil itself, so here must that creative process be accompanied by a second process, one of reception. It is part of a perfect classicism that it should be experienced as classic, that it should subsequently be held worthy to be the model for the moulding and shaping of the individual life.²⁷

This result involves another. Classicism is only too quickly confused with fossilization. Even a Winckelmann could say that nothing was left for a development that had reached its apogee but to decline. How much closer do such reflections lie to an age like ours that is absolutely satiated with the philosophy and psychology of decline. . . . But, on the other hand, we must remember that every classical model, if only we will grasp it with sufficient depth, as the spur to ever-renewed acquisition, is a factor of almost incalculable value for the maintenance and enhancement of any development. No European culture without a classical period has ever yet been seen.

In the case of Rome it so happened, that at the very moment that a Roman classicism arose, it was at once allotted the rôle, hitherto played by the Greeks, of the creative force in the course of development. It is the Augustan culture, then, that takes the place of the Greek as pattern and norm, with which the following centuries, in imitation or emulation, have to deal.

This is particularly noticeable in religion. The order that Augustus established was felt to be authoritative by the circle which we have just described as the bearer of the religion of the state. At the very least it was accounted a definite fact, by which one had to direct one's own conduct. Let us illustrate this very briefly by two sets of examples.

The first shall be the peculiar attitude taken up towards the apotheosis of the Emperor. It had been established by Augustus's own actions as the rule, that the honour of deification should only be assigned to the deceased ruler. This rule continues to hold good for the state-cult, and not only for it, but generally for the Western provinces of the Empire. All attempts that aimed at a divine worship of the living

Emperor himself or at an identification with a god (whether it be Apollo, Jupiter, Hercules or another) enjoyed at most a passing success and broke down sooner or later on the conservatism of the Roman mind. On one such occasion—the proposal of Anicius Cerialis, that to the Emperor Nero should be erected a temple *tamquam mortale fastigium egresso et venerationem hominum merito*—Tacitus lays it down as an inviolable rule that *deum honor principi non ante habetur quam agere inter homines desierit* (*Ann.* 15, 74). Tiberius even went further and, as has long since been known²⁸ and recently confirmed by the newly discovered edicts of Gytheum,²⁹ expressly forbade any divinization of his person even in the Eastern provinces, thus endeavouring to secure for the Roman view authority even beyond its narrower sphere. Claudius, too, in his letter to the people of Alexandria, was at pains, albeit without lasting success, to maintain a similar standpoint.³⁰

The rôle of the senate was of particular importance in this case, for in its charge lay the acceptance of the dead Emperors among the *Divi imperatores*.³¹ It was within its province, then, to decide whether the Emperor in each case was adjudged worthy of apotheosis or not. The senate was fully conscious of the power and claim that this involved; how strongly any mistake in this direction was resented within its own ranks is shown by the lampoon of the younger Seneca on the deification of Claudius; the lampoon is instructive in a second point, because the central importance of the speech of Augustus in the assembly of the gods (c. 10–11) proves that it was he and his actions that were the norm by which his successor was judged.³² Moreover, the senate concerned itself with curbing abuses of the imperial cult and subsequently expelling unworthy members from the circle of the *Divi*. In the year 70, for example, a commission of the senate was appointed by lot with the express task, *ut fastos adulatione temporum foedatos exonerarent modumque publicis impensis facerent* (Tacitus, *Hist.* 4, 40; cp. *Ann.* 18, 41). Much later the senatorial Emperor, Tacitus (275–6), wished only to give admission to the *principes boni* in the temple that he planned for the *Divi* (*Hist. Aug. Tacitus* 9, 5).

From this method of treating the apotheosis of the Emperor it becomes at once plain that the strict view of the state-cult of Rome stood in a certain contrast to the practice observed in other cases. What it denied itself and its reigning prince was given to him by communities, provinces and private individuals in rich, not to say extravagant, style. Not less strong was the tendency to exclusiveness in face of another phenomenon, the inrush of Oriental deities and cults. As early as the last two centuries of the Republic they had become one of the mightiest factors that threatened to shatter the being of Roman religion. Yet now the whole world was full of them, and there have not been wanting voices claiming to recognize in them the only truly vital religion of the Empire.

Two spheres there certainly were in which the Oriental deities remained powerless—and it is remarkable that we have here to do with the two chief seats of ancient culture—the religion of Greece³³ and the religion of Rome in the cult of the state, at least. It is again obvious that the negative attitude to Orientalism in our epoch is only the continuation of what had been established in authoritative form by Augustus. Apart from the one exception of Isis, who received a state temple under the reign of Caligula, no single example can be observed before the beginning of the third century of the penetration of foreign cults into the circle of the traditional gods of Rome.³⁴ Even if many Emperors did not abstain from showing favour to them in private—if Nero, for example, according to his changing mood, showed his reverence or his contempt for the Syrian goddess (Suetonius, *Nero* 56)—all this could not for the time touch the system established by Augustus. There were even found rulers who did not merely respect this order, but even tried to set it emphatically into action. When we read of Hadrian: *sacra Romana diligentissime curavit, peregrina contempsit* (*Hist. Aug. Hadrian.* 22, 10), that can only be interpreted as a deliberate resumption of the attitude of his great predecessor.

To Augustus went back the regulations, that the foreign cults should be kept away from the sacred boundary of the *pomerium*, and even more than that, from the city-territory

proper (Dio Cassius 53, 2, 4; 54, 6, 6). Until the age of the Severi this principle existed inviolate, so that that state temple of Isis of which we have spoken did not receive a place inside the *pomerium*; the goddess was therefore called after the site of her shrine on the Campus Martius, *Isis Campensis* (Apul., *Met.* 11, 26). It appears, then, that a rule was applied, similar to that which had been adopted in earlier times for the Greek gods; though they, too, had their place in the state-cult, they were forbidden to enter the *pomerium*.³⁵

In this last case it becomes plain that not only was the example of Augustus authoritative, but that the treatment of the foreign cults revived a procedure that had been introduced by the nobility of the Republic. In view of those efforts of the Emperor, of which we have spoken, to restore to the senate its old importance in the cult of the state, such an event is of special interest. To it we may add another.

In the year A.D. 19, not very long, that is to say, before the reception of Isis by the state, a private shrine of the goddess was destroyed—for a very justifiable reason, it is true (Josephus, *Ant.* 18, 65 f.; Suetonius, *Tiberius* 36). At the same time followed the expulsion of the *sacra Aegyptiaca et Judaica* from Rome (Tacitus, *Ann.* 2, 85); the measures of Claudius against the Jews (Suetonius, *Claudius* 25, 4) denote a repetition of the procedure. It has been justly observed that this meant simply a continuation of the practice of the senate in the previous two centuries, which had frequently decided on violent measures of a similar kind.³⁶

The religious policy of the Empire, then, once again goes back to the traditions of the senate, and there can hardly be a doubt that this was done with intent. It has been guessed, with a very high degree of probability, that Livy in his report on the case of the Bacchanalia intended by his description of a precedent to establish a model for the treatment of all similar occasions in the future. For his own age and for the time to come it was thus determined how one had to proceed where circumstances made official action against the foreign cults necessary.³⁷ Both the fullness of the narrative of Livy and his exact description of the legal case and procedure are strongly in favour of this view. When

Dio Cassius addresses to the Emperor the warning against all religious innovations as against the *συνωμοσάαι καὶ συντάσεις ἐταγείαι τε*, that attend them (52, 36, 2), this harmonizes perfectly with Livy's conception of the Bacchanalian scandal as a *clandestina coniuratio*.²⁸

Summing up, we may say that Roman religion in the first two centuries of our era is marked by a deliberate retention of the forms that had been created by the Age of Augustus. The bearer of this religion and this religious tradition is the senatorial nobility, whose views essentially were expressed even in cases where the senate did not interfere immediately. The religious policy of the Emperors moves within the frame of such a senatorial tradition, making its principles its own and occasionally not shrinking from having recourse to the same measures as the Republican senate.

From this result we can easily advance to one last peculiarity that is characteristic of the age—I mean, its delight in form for its own sake, the deliberate fostering and development of 'style' as the form of life and being in a closed aristocratic world.

Above all, a hitherto unknown inclination towards display begins to make itself everywhere felt. Now it becomes the universal practice to communicate the protocols of cult-ceremonies to the public in monumental form. The Acts of the Secular celebration of Augustus form for us the beginning; the inscriptional protocols of the Arval Brethren, the Fasti and lists of members of priestly colleges, continue them in long array. A closing-point is marked by the exhaustive report, eternalized on stone, of the Secular festival under Septimius Severus (204); the remains previously known have recently been enlarged by new finds of the highest importance.

With this tendency to make a spectacle of cult goes the fact that the protocols on inscriptions in ever-increasing measure concern themselves with a minute registration of individual procedures, omitting no detail of ritual or place. It has already been observed how they increase in fullness, one might almost say, year by year. Whereas at first they give only a summary report, in later times they hardly spare us a detail. The inscriptional records of the Secular

Games of the year 204, of which we have just spoken, show the same picture. In contrast with the model under Augustus, the record of the acts of festival goes into very much greater detail. The Secular Hymn of an unknown poet is actually given with its full text (the name of the poet is not preserved), in contrast to the comparatively curt style of the Augustan Acts, which content themselves with merely naming the creation of an incomparably greater poet in its due place.

But, above all, art felt the call to develop with the resources at its disposal a grand and impressive style for the cult of the state. In the plastic art it is the relief,³⁹ in the first place, that fought its way to new forms of expression adequate to the dignity of its subject. After the frieze of the Ara Pacis had once set the example, a mighty line of similar creations followed. They deal with a sphere, limited, it is true, but important and representative; procession and triumph,⁴⁰ greeting of the Emperor by the gods of Rome,⁴¹ either in groups or in grand assembly,⁴² apotheosis,⁴³ and, above all, the ever recurrent themes of the solemn sacrifices, which are stamped by the slaying of mighty bulls in the presence of the Emperor.⁴⁴ Beside this representation of the pompous and formal⁴⁵ is developed a delight in the subject for its own sake: the train of beasts for sacrifice,⁴⁶ the vessels of cult,⁴⁷ or such a detail of the ritual of the Salii as is rendered on a mosaic in the Villa Borghese.⁴⁸

But in an even deeper and more decisive sense can the contacts of post-Augustan plastic art be understood in their relation to the contemporary development of Roman religion. The fact that the essence of that religion can be best understood as rooted in tradition and institution (if we may retain this terminology) points to the fact that in art the principle of form—preservation and development of the traditional—stands in the foreground. From this formal element in religion, this conservative principle of style, relations can easily be drawn to the formal and stylistic problems of the culture and art of the Empire in general, as of the plastic art in particular.

So long as the normal and classical for Rome was contained in its Greek models, development moved between two poles;

on the one hand it tended towards an ever-deepening grasp of its model, on the other it delighted in a vigorous and deliberate expression of the native individuality, in rivalry and even in contrast with the Greek norm. This fruitful tension, in which the creation of a Roman culture was achieved, was removed the moment that a proper Roman classic arose in the Augustan age. In place of the direct contrast of Greek norm and Roman peculiarity came a Roman norm and a counter-movement, equally Roman, the deepest endeavour of which was to contradict the norm and to produce in contrast to it a relaxation, a transformation, a complete interruption. In this relation of tension, comparable to that between baroque and classicism, is revealed one of the characteristic internal problems of the culture of the Empire.

Our meaning may be made plain by a contrast of the two tendencies in prose style.⁴⁹ There, too, the representatives of the fixed norm (corresponding to Atticism on the Greek side) confront the new style (Asianism). This new style it is that deliberately breaks those norms, to discharge its message in strain and pathos, in wealth of points, in rhythmic variations and measured periods; it seeks to equal, if not to outdo, the effects of poetry. Similar is the case in painting, as also in the plastic art. There, too, we find a classical tendency⁵⁰—often only latent, but always existent, and often, as, for example, in the epoch of Tiberius, immediately following on the Augustan, and again in the age of Hadrian, rising to uncontested mastery—by the side of another, which in its principles may very well be compared with Asianism. For in it is revealed once more a resolution and exaggeration of inherited, clearly defined forms, only that it obviously must express itself in other ways—in picturesque effect in place of plastic shape, in the introduction of the indefinite and unlimited, in movement and passion,⁵¹ in contrast and pathos, and, not least, in an unrestrained joy in the heightened and colossal effect.

In these respects the state religion can only indirectly be drawn into comparison, for its strictly conservative and traditional character in this age leaves little room for such tensions. But even religion could not entirely escape them.

It is remarkable how the emphatic revival of the religious attitude of Augustus by Hadrian coincides with an epoch of classicism in art, as palpably as could be imagined. In literature and equally in plastic art we cannot mistake the return to the 'ancients'; not only is the language of form deliberately adopted from the reliefs of Augustus, but occasionally a marked archaizing tendency is practised. On the other hand, the age of Nero and the Flavians, the prime of the imperial baroque, is characterized, not indeed by a breach with the Augustan norms, but certainly by a freer attitude towards them, by a less rigorous interpretation, if we may use the phrase. Especially in the imperial cult do we advance to the very edges of the possible. In the case of Nero there was no lack of attempts of deification, and the erection of a colossal portrait-statue in the court of the Golden House (Suetonius, *Nero* 81, 1) brings to expression such an elevation above the earthly sphere as the age of Augustus could never have ventured.⁵² An especially eloquent example is the first poem in the *Silvae* of Statius.⁵³ It is devoted to the equestrian statue erected for Domitian, the *Equus Maximus* on the Forum. In the mighty size of the monument, that not only commands the site, but seems to tower above all the buildings (in this point we may remind ourselves of similar effects in baroque), the poet sees an emblem of the superhuman greatness of the Emperor. To him the gods of the neighbourhood willingly concede their place, and by night, when the heavenly powers delight to visit the earth, the divine kindred of the Emperor descend to engage in intimate converse with his image. Artistic form and religious import here unite to express a nature raised to the supreme height of greatness; in this statue the Emperor is directly made a mediator between earth and the heavenly seat of the gods.

Finally, the religious architecture of Rome demands a mention at this point. It grows in this age into full colossal proportions and creates a magnificent framework for all acts and ceremonies of cult. Even in antiquity it was decisive for the impression that Rome made, and still to-day it is often the most eloquent spokesman for all that that age of supreme external glory has left us. The return

to the models of Augustus is again unmistakable, only that everything is exaggerated to the gigantic and superhuman scale. The vault and the arrangement on the principle of the axis are its chief forms of expression.

Above all, the workings of the Forum of Augustus were most permanent.⁵⁴ An echo of it in the Forum of Nerva cannot be overlooked in the leaning of the back of the temple against an external wall; new in it is the break made in this wall by advanced columns and an engaged entablature, carried forward over the columns. But in that Forum the scantiness of space prevented the development that found all the more unrestricted play in the Forum of Trajan, the celebrated work of Apollodorus of Damascus.⁵⁵ There, too, the temple, dedicated to the deified Trajan and Plotina, forms the termination at the back, but the space in the front is separated off by a transverse Basilica with double apsis; for the first time in the arrangement of a site appears a succession of spaces determined by an axis.⁵⁶

The completion of the Forum of Trajan should probably fall in the reign of Hadrian; many of its detailed forms have even been assigned to the early Antonine age—for example, the formation of the capitals.⁵⁷ Of buildings of Hadrian himself we have first to mention the temple of Venus and Roma founded in the year 118 on the Via Sacra. Here the cult of the city-goddess, that rose first in the provinces and was at first limited to them, found its first admission to the city. The ground-plan and siting of the building are said to go back to Hadrian himself; the present remains, with their impressive 'barrel' arches, date only from the renovation at the beginning of the fourth century.⁵⁸

The more impressive as a Hadrianic building stands the Pantheon on the Campus Martius. It was devoted to the sum of all the gods, and expressed the thought that the single powers fall into the shade behind the unity of the *theoi*. The cult, already known in Asia Minor and in the Hellenistic age, first came to Rome under Augustus; ⁵⁹ in the year 25 B.C. M. Vipsanius Agrippa built a shrine in its honour, in form like the temple of Concordia below the Capitol.⁶⁰ The restoration of Hadrian set in its place a vaulted space, which in the majesty and harmony of its proportions (height and

diameter of the dome are equal) produces an unrivalled effect. The spatial function of the series of concentric ascending vaults is crowned by the mighty eye of the dome, with a diameter of nine metres, which, as the sole source of light, visibly expresses the unity of the building. Here, too, artistic form and religious thought are found united in one all-embracing and inclusive creation.

At the end of the period with which we are dealing stand two events which show that that attitude in religious policy, that had hitherto been consistently followed, was nearing its close. At the outbreak of the Marcomannic War, and under the influence of the plague, Marcus Aurelius summoned to Rome the priests from all sides, who then practised their *peregrini ritus* there and carried out the lustration of the city (*Hist. Aug. M. Aurelius* 18, 1). Let us add a second fact. The Emperor Commodus was recognized by the senate as *Romanus Hercules*. As such he was not, it is true, directly declared a god, but he probably claimed images and sacrifices, *ei immolatum est ut deo* (*Hist. Aug., Commodus* 9, 2). This meant that two of the pillars of the previous order—the rejection of the foreign (that is to say, Oriental) cults and the postponement of the apotheosis of the Emperor until after his death—had both begun to shake on their foundations.

How strong was the influence of this change of attitude has recently been illustrated very happily by the stone of the Matrons, which was found near the Cathedral of Bonn.⁶¹ Here we see how, under the impressions of the plague and in accordance with the example set by the Emperor Marcus the local municipal nobility turned in large measure to the worship of the foreign and, in particular, of the German deities. In Rome itself it is plain that almost all classes of the population had turned in their private practice of cult to other gods than the Roman. The cemetery of the harbour of Ostia (on the Isola Sacra) shows what was in vogue in the second to third centuries; in the face of death religious feeling is wont to reveal itself in unambiguous manner. What we find there are the Dionysiac mysteries⁶² and similar cults of Oriental origin;⁶³ the picture is completed by the 'gnostic' catacomb of the Aurelii (by the Viale

Manzoni) ⁶⁴ or by the graves on the Appian Way, below S. Sebastiano. ⁶⁵ Excavations, too, are making it clear that even the cult of old Roman ⁶⁶ and old Latin deities ⁶⁷ was beginning to be penetrated by Oriental elements.

Finally, we must refer to art, in so far as it, too, shows the approach of a new spirit. The attempt has been made to prove of the Columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius that, despite the close connexion of the two, there is revealed none the less an inner opposition between them, which can only be understood as implying a change of times. ⁶⁸ The change can be observed particularly well in the cult-image. The excavations at the Dolichenum on the Aventine, not far from S. Sabina ⁶⁹ (the name of Commodus appears once on the inscriptions), have revealed a statue of Diana with the rescued Iphigenia and the sacrificed hind at her feet. In its subject, then, it may be compared to the Iphigenia group of the Copenhagen Glypoothek. ⁷⁰ But how differently are the same elements combined in the newly discovered work! With justice, critics have spoken of unclassical tendencies, and these tendencies express themselves in two directions ⁷¹—first, in the frontal position, that only allows one view, as in the case of a relief; then, again, in the replacement of the natural relationship of proportions by an ideal one. The side figures are reduced to minor details, and the goddess can thus grow into superhuman grandeur. Old forms of conception, once familiar to the East, rise here once more in ancient form to life, before the ancient world and the ancient East alike were doomed to quit the stage of history.

Chapter III

THE AGE OF THE SEVERI

THE final shipwreck of the Roman element on Orientalism has usually been placed in the first decades of the third century. The age of Augustus had called halt to the advance of the foreigner and had banished all the forms in which he expressed himself. It had thereby determined the attitude of the next two centuries; the state-religion of Rome was able to maintain itself in its traditional form. Not until the Severi, it has been supposed, was a new leaf turned. Long after the gods of the East had set firm foot in the sphere of private life, this door, so long closed to them, was at last opened. Resistance, of course, there was, but the final issue was the unmistakable penetration of the state-religion of Rome by foreign cults; we can still follow the process to-day by observing the foundations of temples by the different Emperors.

Such a penetration is certainly there; it would be absurd to attempt to deny it. But far harder is the question, whether the long series of gods to whom, it has been supposed, admission among the gods of the state was granted in the age of Severus—the Cappadocian Ma, Jupiter Dolichenus and the Syrian goddess—really attained such a position of privilege. Still harder would it be to grasp with sufficient precision the motives for such admission.

We need not go here into details, the less so as it must be admitted that in the case of the three deities just mentioned, admission into the state-cult can nowhere be proved with any certainty.¹ That despite the lack of such definite evidence this view was adopted, was simply due to the general assumption that the age of the Severi must indubitably have meant the intrusion of the Oriental gods into the state-cult.

On the other hand, there is one certain event that we must recognize—the erection of a state temple to the Alexandrian Serapis on the Quirinal, due to the Emperor Caracalla himself.² Here the god was worshipped in a shrine modelled on the style of an Egyptian temple of the New Empire.³ Sacred slaves in the service of the god are expressly mentioned; the dedicatory inscription of the Emperor is still preserved.⁴ Significant, too, was the site of the new precincts. Since the days of Augustus it had been an at least tacitly accepted practice that all foreign cults of Egyptian or Eastern origin should be, as a matter of principle, kept outside the region encircled by the sacred city-boundary of Rome, the *pomerium*. The new temple of Serapis, to which a mighty flight of steps led up from the Campus Martius, lay immediately on the slope of the Quirinal hill—in fact, on the sacred boundary itself.⁵ It is possible, then, that the Emperor at its foundation deliberately refused to heed the usage of the preceding age.

If this is the case, an innovation there certainly was; but it was hardly as revolutionary as has been supposed. The ancient biographer of the Emperor Caracalla (*Hist. Aug.* 9, 10 f.) had already to contest the view that Caracalla was the first to bring Egyptian cults to Rome.⁶ In this context the name of Commodus is mentioned, but actually Isis and Serapis had had their temples in Rome since the days of the Emperor Gaius, that is to say, for more than 180 years. They lay, it is true, on the northern part of the Campus Martius, beyond the line that still under Hadrian marked the sacred city-boundary.⁷ On the other hand, it is hardly an accident that it was with this foreign cult, so long established in Rome, that the innovation was attempted.

But why was the attempt made? Caracalla, we have been told, when by the *Constitutio Antoniniana* he gave Roman citizenship to all *peregrini*, also bestowed native rights in Rome on the Egyptian gods and, in fact, on foreign cults in general. We should in that case have to do with a political measure, dictated by the will to destroy, to tear down the boundaries of national Rome and to set in the place of its special features a general levelling. A somewhat different judgement must now take its place. The latest

treatment of the preserved text of the *Constitutio* has succeeded in proving that the legislative act of the Emperor owed its existence to a sudden impulse, the effort to make one great throw, binding the subjects to their ruler.⁸ The colossal style of the *Thermae* of Caracalla has been most aptly drawn into comparison,⁹ and even more aptly we have been reminded of the element of Alexander in the whole scheme.¹⁰

This 'Alexander' element brings us into a world of ideas which had a wide influence on the conduct of Caracalla—and not on his alone. There are two great and fundamental conceptions that are confronted in the history of the Empire from the beginning of the autocracy—on the one hand, a national Roman attitude, which would maintain the distinctions between the ruling people and the subjects, between the capital city and Italy and the provinces; on the other, the idea of a world-Empire of the style of the Hellenistic world or, to be even more precise, of Alexander. In that, the fundamental aim was not to isolate and conserve the particular, but to realize itself in one united people. The practical conclusions from the actual community of fate of men the whole world over were to be drawn.

It seems hardly accidental that a ruler who, like Caracalla, inclined so decidedly to the second view should have turned his attention to the temple of Serapis. Whilst the plan of Alexander the Great was to unite the conquered Persians with his own Macedonians in a single people, the Diadochi turned with decision from any such intention. Their aim was directed towards making the rule of the victors over the great mass of the conquered a permanent institution. Only the first Ptolemy once made the attempt to carry on the endeavour of Alexander in the sphere of religion. The god Serapis, whose cult he created with the help of the Greek Timotheus and the Egyptian priest Manetho, was destined to unite in himself Greek and Egyptian traits. He was to be the great world-god, in whose worship both parties might unite. It is only a guess, but it seems not to lack justification, that Caracalla, when he went back to Serapis (and, be it observed, it was only to him, and not to Isis, that the new temple on the Quirinal was assigned), felt that he

was acting once again in the spirit of Alexander, his great model.

We are left, then, with no attempt at a real revolution except the undertaking of Elagabalus, grand-nephew of the wife of Septimius Severus, the Syrian Julia Domna. Elagabalus, when raised to the throne, still regarded himself, first and foremost, as the priest of the Baal of Emesa; from the native name of that god he had chosen his own, and his aim went as high as to make his god the proper lord of Rome. That was why, not content with marrying him to the city-goddess of Carthage, he had transferred to the temple of the new god the most revered objects of Roman religion—the stone of the Great Mother, the shields of the Sali, the fire of Vesta, and the rest.

In the March of 222, after a short reign, Elagabalus was murdered by the troops, and his corpse was thrown into the Tiber; the memory of the Emperor was obliterated and the symbol of his god was returned to its home. Here at once is evident the strength of the national reaction. If we pursue the theme further, we find that on other occasions, too, men were mindful of the religion of Rome and of all that it implied for the state. New discoveries have put us in a position to-day to point to other indications that look in the same direction and give a very different aspect from what has been supposed to the age before and after the appearance of Elagabalus.

The inscriptional Acts, which recorded the repetition of the Secular Games of Augustus in the year 204, under the Emperor Septimius Severus, have always been known in fragments. In recent years important parts have been discovered, among them the very mutilated remains of a poem corresponding to the *Carmen Saeculare* of Horace.¹¹ The first impression, derived from a reading of the fragments, is that the ritual of the Augustan celebration, particularly the traditional forms of the cult, were observed with the most minute care. This strict and consistent maintenance of inherited forms goes so far, that not only did the structure of the festival as a whole remain the same, but that even the details of an antiquated ritual were preserved. With astonishment we hear from the mouth of the Emperor a

prayer to Mother Earth, in which he not only prays for the increase of the Empire in war and peace, but also that the obedience of the Latins may be kept intact to Rome.¹³ This prayer, by which the festival of Augustus sought to legitimize itself as the continuation of a primitive festival, said to have been first celebrated in the year 456 B.C.¹³; this prayer, which even then was a projection of early Roman conditions and early Roman narrowness onto an incomparably larger and more brilliant present—this was actually retained in an age in which the Empire had attained its greatest extension.

Such a continuation of very early tradition is only intelligible as a deliberate attitude. We cannot escape the conclusion that we have here a deliberate emphasis and acceptance of a sphere of state-religion, hallowed by its venerable antiquity. The innovations, on the other hand, do not at first extend beyond external matters, as, for example, a changed form of the games whether scenic or in the circus. Even there such a piece of pedantry as the wooden theatre from the age of Naevius and Ennius¹⁴ was retained, perhaps also the *ludus Troiae* that was traced back to the Eastern origin of the Romans.¹⁵ The only considerable innovations are those that cover less the realm of cult than of politics. They are few in number, but too characteristic and significant to be overlooked here.

In the first place, the number of the matrons, who personify the 110 years of a Saeculum, is reduced to 109. For the Empress Julia Domna stands apart from the group; she it is who completes the traditional number.¹⁶ This participation of the Empress, and even more her privileged position, was still foreign to the age of Augustus, and it accords with this emphasizing of the dynasty that Caracalla should take part in the ceremonies of cult by the side of his father. A further reference to the peculiar character of the rule of Severus is seen in the fact that among the matrons of senatorial rank others share who come from the new military order of knights. At the close of the list stand the matrons, who are married to tribunes and *primipili*, officers of the middle class.¹⁷ Expressly named after their origin, they demonstrate the enhanced importance of the army within

the state. It already appears as the real power; it was soon to take the place of the senate as the all-deciding factor. Among the matrons of knightly rank we meet such a name as that of Julia Soemias Bassiana, wife of Sextus Varius Marcellus; as mother of Elagabalus she will one day take a decisive part in the politics of the Empire.

We must expressly emphasize the fact—the more so, as it stands in such marked contrast to the general conservatism of the Acts—that the new form of the state under the Severi is so plainly shown. A path will open up for us from this point to observations of some little importance. The same result can be obtained from yet another monument—we mean, the reliefs of historical content which come from the Arch of Septimius Severus in his native city of Leptis Magna.¹⁸ These reliefs, the date of origin of which lies only one year before the Secular festival,¹⁹ render among military scenes other events that illustrate dynastic policy. By the triumphal procession of the Emperor appears a similar procession of Caracalla. Other parts are taken up by a sacrifice in the presence of the Augusta, the nomination of the second son, Geta, as *princeps iuventutis* (if the interpretation is correct)²⁰—once again, we observe, in the presence of the Augusta. This new importance of the family, especially of the women, distinguishes the Severi from the adoptive Emperors of the preceding century, under whom that principle of succession, from which they take their name, was only interrupted at the succession of Commodus. In place of a decidedly male point of view, which selects the best man as successor, come new and different ties, among which the wiles and stratagems of women show themselves as forces to be reckoned with.

By the side of the dynastic principle there is represented on these reliefs the new structure of the state. Again it is the representatives of the army, that appear by the side of the governing senate. In the great acts of state, and also in the scenes of cult, they take the same rank.

Finally, our discussion of these reliefs must deal with the long series of deities who attend as witnesses at the scenes there depicted; with this we come back to our subject proper. Whether they appear in their full form or, as

occasionally happens, in their images,²¹ we have always to do with a clearly defined circle—the gods of the state-cult of Rome, as sanctioned by the now classical age of Augustus. Nowhere do the powers of Oriental religion appear,²² not to speak of the gods of primitive African superstition.

This refusal to leave the boundaries of a specifically Roman realm is further shown in the relation of Emperor to gods. Even if occasionally Jupiter seems to bear the features of the Emperor and Juno those of the Empress²³—and this is not certain—we are still far from a ‘deification’ of the imperial pair. For when, on other occasions, the divine and earthly rulers are shown side by side,²⁴ that is at once enough to show that a final identification of the two was to be avoided. The two spheres could touch one another and even at times pass over into one another, but in principle they remain distinct. We ought hardly to judge the present case in any other way than we judge the occasional giving of the features of Augustus to a statue of Mercurius or the representation of the same Emperor in the library of the Palatine *habitu ac statu Apollinis*. Augustus wished to be seen in this Apollo-like form and to be approximated to the god; so did his successors with themselves and the image of the supreme god. The difference of expression may be significant, a difference of fundamental attitude does not exist.

The third recent find, that must be mentioned in this context, is a list of festivals of the early third century, which is preserved at least in one very important part.²⁵ Composed in Latin, it is one of those papyri which M. Rostovtseff found in the frontier-fortress of Dura, on the southern bank of the Euphrates. Like the rest, this papyrus comes from the auxiliary troop that was stationed there. In point of time it belongs to the reign of Alexander Severus, or, to be more exact, as the mention of the first wife of the Emperor shows, to the years 225–7.²⁶ The gap is beginning to close that has hitherto existed between the calendars of festivals, hewn on stone of the Augustan age, and the manuscript-calendar of Furius Dionysius Filocalus of the year 854.²⁷

Instructive as a comparison in details might be, we must confine ourselves to the vital points.²⁸ In keeping with the

military character on the one hand, and the Oriental origin on the other, is the fact that the festivals of the city of Rome, before all, the foundation-days of the different temples, take up a relatively small space. But they are not lacking, and, what is more important, they nowhere show any traces of ceremonies of Eastern origin. This should be the more underlined, because in a list of festivals from a region where the Eastern provinces of Syria and Mesopotamia and the newly constituted Sassanian Empire meet, the exact opposite might have been expected. We miss, for example, the series of festivals of Attis from the 15th to the 26th of March, which are mentioned by name in the late Roman calendars. When the biographer of Alexander Severus, then, writes as if, as early as the first half of the third century, the festival of Attis, the *Hilaria*, was already among the most important ceremonies of the state (35, 6; cp. *v. Aur.* 1, 1), the new list of festivals brings no confirmation of his statement; rather, it confirms the criticism that has already been exercised from other grounds on the second of the two passages quoted.²⁹ We must reckon with the possibility that conditions of a later date, attested by the so-called calendar of Filocalus, and therefore probably belonging to the fourth century and no earlier, have been illegitimately projected back upon the third century by the imperial biographer, who himself lived at the end of the fourth century.

Again we seem to find proof that such a thorough process of Orientalization, as has been assumed for the age of the Severi, is far from corresponding to the facts. At Dura, the find-spot of our papyrus, if ever the worship of local or even of Oriental deities appears within the troop stationed there, it is always within the sphere of private life. Here belongs, for example, that fresco that has so soon become famous, with the tribune Terentius sacrificing to the Palmyrene deities, set up in the court of the temple dedicated to them.³⁰ This Terentius, as his epitaph, written in verse, shows, was commandant of the 20th cohort of the Palmyrene archers stationed in Dura, and soldiers of this corps appear beside him in the scene. Yet it must be a private ceremony that is intended. For, on the one hand, we know that the official shrine of the archers was in another place;

on the other, our fresco appears among a series of other frescoes set up on the same site and representing in every case acts of private cult. And it is only the tribune personally who appears, not his troop.

We must cast one last glance at the festival-list of Dura and consider that group of ceremonies, that meets us there beside the ceremonies of Roman cult—we mean, those of the imperial cult. If we disregard the mentions of Divus Julius, Matidia and the Emperor Claudius (the last probably only preserved because of the accident of his birthday falling on the same day as that of Pertinax), all the ceremonies are devoted either to the members of the Severan dynasty or to such Emperors as that dynasty had markedly chosen to be associated with—the last Antonines, for example, or Pertinax, whom we have just mentioned. Although the interest is strictly directed to the present, and the reigning Emperor, in particular, stands well in the foreground, yet the inherited forms of the imperial cult are strictly observed. Only the dead and consecrated member of the ruling house receives the title of *divus* and, with it, divine nature. For the lord of the moment ceremonies of all kinds are, it is true, prescribed, but the title of a god remains forbidden to him. We have still to do with the conception introduced into the state-religion by Augustus.

If we now review the results obtained from the recent discoveries that we have quoted, we must admit that they yield no confirmation, but rather a reversal, of what has up to now been believed to be true of the Severi. At least under Septimius Severus and then, again, under Severus Alexander there is not a trace of Orientalization to be seen. What our witnesses, one and all contemporary, reveal, is a vigorous emphasizing of Roman religion. We are thus enabled to emend a tradition which at first sight seems to lead to different conclusions. In the case of Alexander Severus, at least, we may point to the fact that even the later tradition has stories to tell of the special estimation in which he held the Roman priestly colleges (*Hist. Aug., v. Al. Sev.* 22, 5).

That the view thus suggested must be the correct one is further shown by the fact that it throws light on another

phenomenon. Besides the Secular Acts we have another series of protocols of cult in relatively complete numbers—the Acts of the Roman Arval Brethren. These reports, preserved on inscriptions, show towards their close—they break off with the middle of the third century—an unusual and continuously increasing fullness. It is especially from these latest parts of the Arval Acts that we can form a picture of the details of the proceedings of the cult; the famous hymn of the priesthood in old Latin, for example, is preserved on a protocol of the year 218 (CIL. 1, 2², 1). This peculiarity, which has been already noted and which I have before interpreted as showing a delight in the form of the style of old Roman culture, now finds its true place in a contemporary context. It is the same diligent, almost painfully exact, observance of the inherited ritual, that deliberate featuring of its peculiarities and archaisms, that we have already met with at the Secular festival of 204. In the Arval Acts the emphasis on the traditional and Roman character of the state-religion again finds expression.³¹

We need only make brief reference to other facts that may be quoted in support of the view here maintained. The sudden emergence of a patristic literature in Latin, the violence with which a Tertullian attacks the Roman gods and Roman cult before all others—all this fits in with our picture of an emphatic and conscious advertisement of the national religion of Rome.

What is involved is essentially, as we have already emphasized, a return to the forms which were established in the Augustan age. Of innovation there is even less than in the immediately preceding centuries. But we must nevertheless raise the question, how and why did this attitude come to be adopted? We must bear in mind that we are in an age when the first storms were beginning to pass over the Empire. No damage, it is true, was yet done to its external form. But the Germans had grown to be a novel and an unaccustomed danger. And in the place of the Parthian Empire the incomparably more vigorous dynasty of the Sassanids was destined to rise, which itself stood for a conscious return to its own past and inherited values. The national Iranian element and, especially, the national religion of Zarathustra

stood in the centre of the Sassanian state and its policy. It is certainly no accident that in Rome at the same time a similar self-recollection took place. It is significant that in that search for new forms, of which the third century is full, the attempt was once more made to base them on a Roman foundation.

Chapter IV

THE END

THE official authority of inherited beliefs had rested on the fact that Emperor and Senate together came forward as its guardians and protectors. They had kept the state-cult free from alien tendencies and had done their best to prevent them from intruding. About the middle of the third century the long-maintained fiction of the 'dyarchy', fiction though it had at times been, finally collapsed. The senatorial order was almost completely ousted from the imperial administration by the knights and, under Gallienus, military service was entirely closed to it. The senate now retired from its political rôle and confined itself to being a cultural force of purely conservative character, concerned more with the greatness of the past than with that of the present. As such we shall meet it once again in the very last battle of the Roman religion for its existence.

This being the case, our treatment of the sequel, down to the final victory of the new creed, must limit the range of its material even more severely than before. It will have to do, not with the intruding but essentially foreign elements, but with what still remained preserved and active of the old forms. Or, to put it in other words, we must endeavour, inside that mixture of gods and Orientalism that now find their way with increasing ease into Roman religion, to separate out the Roman element.

This Roman element is stronger and more important than has usually been assumed. In closing, we will collect at least some of the evidence that may be adduced in its support.

The decisive act of the Emperor Aurelian is the foundation of a cult of the sun-god, which was designed to express in the sphere of religion that unity of the Empire that he had

just restored.¹ On the Campus Agrippae the *deus Sol invictus* received in the year 274 his shrine; it was built out of the booty of Palmyra. The *Ἡλίου καὶ Βήλου ἀγάλματα* which are mentioned in it (Zosimus 1, 61, 2) will only suit an originally Syrian deity; we think at once, then, of the Belus or Sol of Palmyra.² Accompanied by two divine consorts, he appears from the beginning of the third century in the region of the armies of the Danube and also in Rome.³ Within the state-cult, it is true, everything was done in the old traditional forms. An *agon Solis* (similar to the *agon Capitolinus*), recurring every four years, was instituted; the cult lay in the hands of a college which, under the name of the *pontifices Solis*, took its place beside the priesthood hitherto called *pontifices* and now also named *pontifices Vestae*. This Roman element is of particular importance, as to-day an old Roman worship of the Sun may count as assured; ⁴ this very contrast of Sol and Vesta seems to have been borrowed from it.⁵

An important part is next played by the dynasty of Diocletian. His religious policy is marked by a conservative tendency. The newly introduced cult of Sol Invictus in the dedications and coin-legends falls strangely behind Jupiter, Hercules and the new and very common legend, *genius populi Romani*.⁶ In contrast to Aurelian, who allowed himself to be officially worshipped as *dominus et deus*,⁷ Diocletian went back to the old practice. When he denoted himself as Jovius and his colleague Maximian denoted himself as Herculus, that certainly involved no deification of the living rulers, but only a close relationship to these two protecting deities.⁸

Above all, the importance of this Roman element in declining paganism comes into prominence when we try to draw the lines that connect it with the thought of Rome, particularly since that thought of Rome has been placed in quite a new light by the researches of F. Schneider ⁹ and P. E. Schramm.¹⁰

The intimate connexion between the Roman religion and the idea of the state has constantly been emphasized in our narrative; we have remarked it once again at the foundation of the cult of Sol by Aurelian. This connexion had gained

an added weight when the gods of Rome tended ever more and more to lose any independent, self-sufficient existence that they might possess and to enter into the service of that idea of the state. In the dialogue of Minucius Felix, the champion of paganism expresses himself to the effect that nothing certain can be discovered about the fundamental problems of existence, and that therefore, for practical reasons, one must abide by the old gods of the state. This suggests a result that was to be of decisive importance for the future. It can no more be said that Roman religion is one of the great and independent expressions of Roman character, standing beside Roman literature, Roman law and government, contributing by its rich development to making visible the might of that character. No, it is only from the accepted conceptions of Rome and Empire that the gods now draw any justification for existence. That justification consists not in their being gods, but in their being gods of Rome.

This change of valuation was finally accomplished at the moment that these gods were consciously set in relation with the idea of Rome. This idea had already a long and varied history behind it¹¹—it, too, had received its final shape in the epoch of Augustus—before, towards the close of antiquity, it took a new and important turn. After the foundation of the new metropolis on the shores of the Bosphorus, it was more and more a great past that was incorporated in the name of Rome. The pride of old days now changed into a half-painful memory, with a hope of future renewal as its opposite pole. In Rome were now united the recollections of a glorious history, but also the belief in the eternity of city and Empire, in a unique rôle determined by fate and, not least, in the sum-total of the ideas that still remained in life from the old religion.¹²

It is in this function that Roma appears in the speech which the last great champion of paganism, Symmachus, delivered before the Emperor, Valentinian II (375-92), and in which he sets out from the demand for the restoration of the altar of Victory that had been removed from the senate-house.¹³ The Roma begs for respect to be paid to her age and for attention to her wishes: 'Permit me', she says, 'to continue to hold to my ancestral belief, for I

take my delight in it. Permit me to live after my own fashion, for I am a free woman. This religion has laid the circle of the earth at my feet, has beaten back Hannibal from my walls, the Gauls from the Capitol. Was I to be kept alive, only to be attacked in my old age? Whatever these desires that you present to me may be, it would be too late, it would be shameful to try innovations in my hoary age'.¹⁴

This is just the point at which the belief in the Roman gods begins to pass over into that thought of Rome that we find at the close of the ancient world and the beginning of the Middle Age.¹⁵ It is clear how already, in the mouth of a conscious champion of paganism, the old religion no longer represents an independent world of its own, but has become a part of the general conception of the *Urbs aeterna*, the *aurea Roma*. Roman state-cult and the cult of the great past of Rome coincide, and so coincide that the national thought of Rome takes into itself all that was still left of the other.

In one more case we can expose the line of connexion that leads on to the thought of Rome in the early Middle Age.

If we ask the question, who in the later times longest retained the belief in the gods of the forefathers, we are ordinarily referred in the first place to the peasant population of the open country. Their name, *pagani*, has become the general description of heathendom, and in detail, many traces can be shown of the retention of the old belief in the country far on into the following centuries. We would in no way underestimate the importance of the conservatism here revealed, and yet we must state it plainly, that paganism has no importance for the working of Roman religion as a spiritual form. There is in paganism no trace of conscious grasp of this form, still less of any conscious decision in its favour. All that remained and found expression in that conservatism was simply a natural bondage and continuance within a set of conditions once established.

In Rome too, heathendom held its ground with great tenacity, still being tolerated there by the imperial government, when the old religion had long since been forbidden in the rest of the Empire. In the calendar of the Chronographer of 854 the old festivals of the gods, including those

of Oriental origin, still appear,¹⁶ and when, three years later, Constantius II visited Rome, he was not only deeply moved by the memorials of the past, but he even gave acknowledgment once more to the existing order by his conferment of priesthoods on the senatorial nobility (Ammianus Marcellinus 16, 10, 14 f.; Symmachus, *rel.* 8, 7, p. 281, 80 S.). That Julian should have celebrated himself as *restitutor Romanae religionis* (CIL, 8, 4326) is less surprising than that his successors should not have found themselves ready at first for vigorous counter-measures. Gratian was the first to disdain to accept as Emperor the rank of *pontifex maximus*.¹⁷

Among the forces that made this resistance possible, popular belief was less effective than a second cause.¹⁸ In Rome it was a definite class that, in the realization that a principle was at stake, raised high the banner of the old belief. The senatorial nobility of Rome, which from of old and, in special degree, from the age of Augustus onwards, had made the cause of Roman religion its own, till the end showed itself aware of its historical debt of honour; the consciousness of being the bearer of native belief had remained steadily alive in these circles. Thus among the last champions in the city of Rome of the heathen creed appears a series of illustrious names. Recognizing the position that was allotted them in the decisive fight, these men did not shrink from undertaking the priestly offices that had to be filled, sometimes in great accumulation. Thus, for example, the father of Q. Aurelius Symmachus belongs to the old Roman colleges of the *pontifices maiores* and the *quindecimviri* (CIL. 6, 1698). A Vettius Agorius Praetextatus is *augur*, *pontifex Vestae* and *pontifex Solis*, *quindecimvir* and many other things (CIL. 6, 1778 f.): for Macrobius he was *princeps religiosorum* (1, 11, 1) and *sacrorum omnium praesul* (1, 17, 1). The same men, even when the support of the city-cult of Rome by the state was withdrawn by imperial edict (382), found the expenses out of their means, and thus, until the final prohibition (395),¹⁹ succeeded in maintaining the service of the gods.

The connexion with the thought of the Rome of the early Middle Age is revealed, if we reflect that the maintenance

of the old belief was for that definite circle only one side of its activity—an activity which extended to the preservation of old Roman customs, of the great historical traditions in general, and of Roman literature not least. To this circle of high-minded and like-purposed men, that meets us in part in the *Saturnalia* of Macrobius, belonged of the nobility of Rome,²⁰ apart from the already mentioned Symmachus and Praetextatus, a Clodius Hermogenianus Caesarius, a Virius Nicomachus Flavianus, and an Alfenius Caionius Iulianus Kamenius. Their united efforts failed, it is true, to maintain the state-cult, but it is their merit that the belief in the eternity of the city, that Roman quality and the masterpieces of a brilliant literature were saved for the future. In the *sacrum studium literarum* (Macrobius, *Sat.* 1, 7, 8) their efforts finally found something of a vent and were crowned by the grand work of salvage undertaken by Cassiodorus.²¹

The welcome and further development that the declining Roman heathendom found in the thought of Rome has its counterpart in the revivals of antiquity, which in diverse form introduce the various decisive periods of the history of the European spirit. The simple belief in the old gods was never recovered in them—that was certainly never the case. What *was* recovered was the attitude to man and the world, of which those gods were the expression; the belief in the grandeur, the dignity and the central position of man; the conviction that in him the divine had found its most significant revelation; the deliberate prizing of after-fame as the crown of human existence.²² This capacity for renaissances, of which the phenomenon that we now call by that name is only the most palpable example, raises the question, how far we are justified in speaking of a fall of the ancient world and, with it, of a fall of the ancient religions at all. It is a question, at least, whether we should speak of a fall in the sense in which the word is so often used, meaning to imply that the old gods had no longer the vital power to maintain themselves before a new world. How suspicious such a formulation is must become clear the moment that we raise the further question, whether it was not so much a lack of vitality in those divine figures as a lack of capacity in a degenerate and self-distrustful age that was responsible for

the fall. In that case, the age itself would have lacked the power, the essential greatness, to understand the importance of the inheritance which it was asked to win for itself. A view that makes play with a life-force and life in general, may be running the risk of not really making this supposed force, but human weakness, the standard of its judgement.

The great forms of the spirit are subject to other laws than those of the organic world, which knows nothing but birth, maturity and decay. Once created, they are a permanent fact and, as such, an encouragement to ever new apprehension and attainment; they are also a measure and a pattern for the native creations of the times to come. Subject to changing forms of contemplation and appraisalment they may be, but from the law of simple death and decay they remain for ever absolved.

. . . .

Notes

BOOK I

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

¹ 2nd edition, Munich 1912 (quoted as *RuKDR*²).

² *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* 1904 (quoted as *ZGLN*.).

³ I must quote my own works, as I shall have frequently to refer back to them. They are *Griechische Götter im alten Rom*, *Religionsgesch. Versuche und Vorarbeiten* (quoted as *RGVV*.) 22, 1; *Terra Mater*, *ibid.*, 22, 2; *Epochen der Römischen Geschichte* (Frankf. *Stud. zur Religion und Kultur der Antike* 9); *Weltherrschaft und Krise* (*ibid.*, 12), quoted as *GG.*, *TM.*, *Epochen* 1 und 2.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

¹ A. v. Blumenthal, *Indogerman. Forsch.* 47, 48 f.; cp. E. Vetter, *Glotta* 20, 23 f., and E. Norden, *Altgermanien* 228. This, of course, tells us nothing about the bearers of the protohistoric Picentine civilization; they undoubtedly represented an earlier stratum of population; cp. E. Norden, *a. O.* 232 f.

² U. v. Wilamowitz, *Sitz. Ber. Berl. Akad.* (quoted as *SBBA*.) 1906, 59 f.; *Der Glauben der Hellenen* 1, 48 f.; 77 f.; 2, 66 f.; *Eurip. Herakl.*³ 1 f.

³ Cp. the pioneer work of H. Schuchardt, *Leipzig. Probevorlesung* 1870 (*Schuchardt-Brevier*³ 166 f.).

⁴ Here and in the following pages cp. P. Kretschmer, *Einlfg. i. d. Altertumswiss.* I² 6, 108 f.; G. Devoto, *Gli antichi Italici* 43 f.; *Silloge Ascoli* 200 f.; esp. 240; in reference to it, Th. Vetter, *Glotta* 20, 3 f.; J. B. Hofmann, *Indog. Forsch. Anz.* 47, 177; L. Weisgerber, *Ber. d. Röm.-German. Kommiss.* 20, 169 f.; *Verf., Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* 8, 156; V. Pisani, *Italica* 5, n. 1; *Rendic. dei Lincei* 1938, 611 f.; detail in G. Pasquali, *Preistoria della poesia Romana* 19 n. 1; 155 n. 1; F. Specht, *Die. Lit. Ztg.* 1932, 543 f.

⁵ W. Schulze, *ZGLN*. 46; F. Sommer, *Indog. Forsch.* 42, 123 (a new piece of evidence in the inscription of Cadore: R. S. Conway, *Studi Etruschi* 4, 288 f.; *Preitalic dialects* 1 nr. 162); H. Krahe, *Zeitschr. f. Ortsnamenforschung* 7, 16; *Glotta* 17, 94 f.

⁶ F. Sommer, *Indog. Forsch.* 42, 124 f. The result is certain for the initial sound: venet. *vhrateri*, dative singular of Indog. **bhrāter*, Latin *frater*; venet. *vhaɣʒʒo*, 3rd person of singular of an s-aorist of **dhak*, Latin *facio* of root **dhē*; venet. *vhetiana-*, Latin *fetialis* (H. Krahe, *Indog. Forsch.* 53, 68). A suggestion about Indo-Germanic *gh* in P. Kretschmer, *Einlfg. in d. Gesch. d. griech. Sprache* 268 ff. Whether we must assume a corresponding change medially

depends on the interpretation of the signs α and φ ; cp. F. Sommer, op. cit. 97 f.; R. Thurneysen, *Wochenschrift für klass. Philol.* 1892, 290 f.; *Glotta* 21, 4 f.

⁷ Cp. also V. Pisani, op. cit. 615. There is no conviction in P. Kretschmer's attempt to place the transition from aspirate 'media' to soft spirants as early as the time when Venetians and Italians were still settled North of the Alps (*Glotta* 21, 120). One of his examples, *Φεύγον*, is subject to the difficulties that he himself raises (op. cit. 120 ff.). In the case of *Φγογοννδλωνς* we have to do with a German, not an Illyrian people; it cannot be proved that the name reached the authority of Ptolemaeus in 'Venetian-Ombronian' pronunciation and from the mouth of a member of these tribes.

⁸ W. Schulze, *Gött. gel. Anzeig.* 1895, 547; on the age of the cult in Italy see author, *GG.* 31 f., esp. 37. In view of the reference of J. B. Hofmann in Leifer-Goldman, *Zum Problem d. Forumsinschrift* 84 n. to Etruscan *pultuke*, we must bear in mind what has been pointed out by G. Devoto, *Studi Etr.* 2, 323 f. and F. Sommer, *Handbuch*² 80.

⁹ F. Sommer, op. cit. 80; M. Leumann in Stolz-Schmalz, *Lat. Gramm.*⁶ 297; K. Götz, *Indog. Forsch.* 41, 117; an example is *bruma* from **brouma*, **breuma* = **brevima*; cp. E. Norden, *D. Geburt d. Kindes* 18 n. 4; on the root formation, op. author, *TM.* 22 n. 4.

¹⁰ P. Orsi, *Mon. Linc.* 30, 323 f.; N. Catanuto, *Not. d. scav.* (quoted as *Nsc.*) 1931, 659 f.

¹¹ *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Sprachw.* (quoted as *K.Z.*) 35, 212 f.

¹² *Indog. Forsch.* 48, 238 f.

¹³ *Indog. Forsch.* 50, 232 f.; cp. E. Vetter, *Glotta* 23, 195 f.

¹⁴ A. v. Blumenthal, op. cit. 236.

¹⁵ A. v. Blumenthal, op. cit. 236; M. Leumann, op. cit. 243, 249; L. Wenger, *Miscellanea Ehrle* 2, 32.

¹⁶ W. Schulze, *K.Z.* 32, 223 f.

¹⁷ Attested as loan-word from the Latin by E. Goidànich, *I rapporti culturali e linguist. fra Roma e gli Italici* (*Rendic. Acad. Bologna* III 44) 5, 15 f.; cp. M. Leumann, *Glotta* 23, 123.

¹⁸ F. Ribezzo, *Riv. Indo-Gr. Ital.* (quoted as *RIGI.*) 12, 198; G. Devoto, *Silloge Ascoli* 215.

¹⁹ A. v. Blumenthal, op. cit. 231.

²⁰ U. v. Wilamowitz, *SBA.* 1901, 1285 n. 2; Pindar 225 n. 2; even in view of F. Jacoby's Adnotatio to the passage in Hesiod.

²¹ F. Ribezzo, *RIGI.* 17, 197 f.; cp. E. Vetter, *Glotta* 23, 206 f.; V. Pisani, *Italica* 1 f.; *Studi Italiani di filog. class.* 1934, 315 ff.; cp. A. v. Blumenthal, *Indog. Forsch.* 23, 149 f., author, *Studi ital.* 1934, 326 f.

²² M. Niedermann, *Essai d' étymologie et de critique verbale latine* 23 f.

²³ Important is the appearance of the river *Sicanos* and the city name *Sicana* in the old Periplus, which is at the base of Avienus (469, 479). For the position cp. A. Schulten, *Arch. Anz.* 1927, 232; 1939, 553; further *Numantia* 1, 27 f.; Pauly-Wissowa's *Realencyklopädie* (quoted as *RE.*) 2 A, 2549 f. For a brilliant guess, see E. Levy, *Studi etruschi* 8, 177.

²⁴ Here and for the following passage, cp. L. Malten, *Archiv. f. Religionswiss.* 29, 48 f.; W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 596; V. Pisani, *Italica* 5 n. 2.

²⁵ A. Ernout, *Les éléments étrusques du vocabulaire latin* (*Bull. d. la soc. ling.* 30), 82 f.; for linguistic contacts cp. B. A. Terracini, *Studi Etruschi* 8, 209 f.; cp. S. P. Cortsen, *Glotta* 23, 183 f.; for the names of gods derived from Latin, cp. B. Nogara, *Gli Etruschi e la loro civiltà* 166.

²⁶ Cp. above all G. Herbig, *Indog. Forsch.* 37, 168 f.; the latest work is K. Kerényi, *Ungar. Jahrb.* 12, 112 f.

²⁷ G. Herbig, op. cit. 87, 185 n. 2.

²⁸ O. A. Danielsson, *Glotta* 16, 86 f.; S. P. Cortsen, *ibid.* 23, 156.

²⁹ On *Junonius* and *Junonialis* see Th. Mommsen, *Röm. Chronologie* 220 n. 9; W. F. Otto, *Philologus N.F.* 18, 166.

³⁰ Besides W. Schulze's work we may also refer to P. Kretschmer, *Einl. f. d. Altertumswiss.* I³, 6, 111 f.

³¹ G. Devoto, *Studi etr.* 3, 259 f.

³² P. Kretschmer, *Einleitung in die Altertumswiss.* I³ 6, 111.

³³ F. Münzer, *Röm. Adelsparteien* 46 f.; cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 2, 387.

³⁴ Cp. most recently F. Messerschmidt, *Bronzezeit und frühe Eisenzeit in Italien* 18 f.; F. Matz, *Gnomon* 12, 102 f.

³⁵ The latest treatment is in F. Messerschmidt, op. cit. 41; *Gnomon* 1935, 186 f.; C. Schuchhardt, *Alteuropa*³ 128 f.

³⁶ F. Messerschmidt, *Bronzezeit und frühe Eisenzeit in Italien* 20; F. Matz in H. T. Bossert, *Gesch. d. Kunstgewerbes* I, 190, 192.

³⁷ F. Messerschmidt, op. cit. 25 f.

³⁸ F. Messerschmidt, op. cit. 24. F. Matz (op. cit. 409 f.) questions this on what appear to me to be insufficient grounds.

³⁹ F. Messerschmidt, op. cit. 22, 24, 26, 29.

⁴⁰ F. Messerschmidt, op. cit. 21.

⁴¹ P. Ducati, *Storia di Bologna* I, 72; F. Messerschmidt, op. cit. 22.

⁴² Cp. for example the confused results in which J. Sundwall's otherwise successful and judicious Villanova studies 114 f. end.

⁴³ F. Messerschmidt, op. cit. 22.

⁴⁴ In the sense of K. Schuchhardt, *Alteuropa*³ 88 f.

⁴⁵ A. Mayr, *Reallex. d. Vorgesch.* 7, 368; *Abhandl. Bayer. Akad.* 1901, 718 f.; Hoernes-Menghin, *Urgesch. d. bild. Kunst* 212, 350, 704.

⁴⁶ A. Mayr, *Reallex.* 7, 366 f.; Hoernes-Menghin, op. cit. 350.

⁴⁷ C. Schuchhardt, *Alteuropa*³ 72, 89 f.; A. Mayr, *Reallex.* 7, 307.

⁴⁸ A. Mayr, *ibid.* 7, 365; *Abhandl.* 1901, 700 f.; pl. X 2; Th. Zammit, *Prehistoric Malta* pl. XXII f.; L. M. Ugolini, *Malta* 50 f.; fig. 23 f.; Hoernes-Menghin, op. cit. 209.

⁴⁹ C. Schuchhardt, op. cit. 104 f.; examples in the *Reallex. d. Vorgesch.* 7, taf. 98-9; more in R. Battaglia, *Jahrbuch f. prähist. und ethnogr. Kunst* (quoted as *IPEK*) 1927, 181 f.

⁵⁰ L. M. Ugolini, op. cit. pl. XI. A second, highly characteristic piece in Hoernes-Menghin, op. cit. 211, fig. 1.

⁵¹ Th. Zammit, op. cit. pl. XVII.

⁵² Th. Zammit, op. cit. pl. XXII; L. M. Ugolini, op. cit. 139 fig. 71.

⁵² A. Mayr, *Reallex.* 7, 365.

⁵⁴ Hoernes-Menghin, op. cit. 209 figs. 1 and 3; L. M. Ugolini, op. cit. 55 f.; fig. 26-9.

⁵⁵ Th. Zammit, op. cit. pl. XXII 1.; XXVII; L. M. Ugolini, op. cit. tav. VI; Hoernes-Menghin, op. cit. 209, fig. 1.

⁵⁶ Th. Zammit, op. cit. pl. XXIV, 1-8.

⁵⁷ A. Mayr, *Reallex.* 7, 358.

⁵⁸ Tarxien is characteristic of this; cp. Th. Zammit, op. cit. plan to p. 4; L. M. Ugolini, op. cit. 45; fig. 19.

⁵⁹ C. Schuchhardt, op. cit. 99; another view in A. Mayr, *Reallex.* 7, 358.

⁶⁰ For the Gigantia, cp. C. Schuchhardt, op. cit. 98.

⁶¹ For the 'passion for the cave', cp. L. Frobenius, *Erlebte Erdteile* 4, 105 f.; *Unbekanntes Afrika* 69; *Schicksalskunde* 105.

⁶² *Papers B. S. Rome* 6, 95 fig. 15.

⁶³ A. Mayr, *Abhandl.* 1901, 649 f.; *Reallex.* 7, 360; Th. Zammit, op. cit. 42 f.

⁶⁴ A. Mayr, op. cit. 7, 362, 366.

⁶⁵ Ibid. 7, 369; Th. Zammit, op. cit. 46 f.

⁶⁶ C. Schuchhardt, op. cit. 99.

⁶⁷ A. Mayr, op. cit. 7, 361.

⁶⁸ A. Mayr, *Reallex.* 7, 361. The view that the squatting figures represent women, the higher ones men, has been questioned by C. Schuchhardt (op. cit. 105); for the Cretan parallels there quoted, cp. A. Möbius, *Ath. Mitt.* 1916, 154. Even Th. Zammit (op. cit. 94 f.) has abandoned his former view (A. Möbius, op. cit. 127), and no longer describes any of these figures as male. Squatting and sitting are very clearly distinguished from one another. 'For thought that visualizes . . . the chair raises man physically and spiritually above his surroundings; it makes him "a head taller than the other people" (1 Sam. x. 23) cowering on the ground' (A. Möbius, op. cit. 124). That was why seat and throne belonged originally to the god alone, after him to rulers and the half-divine dead, as A. Möbius's work shows. The seated figures, then, at least, which strangely enough are all clothed, must be goddesses; rulers and dead are excluded, because we must then expect to find representations of male figures, too. Whether the squatting figures are mortal women or servants of the goddess cannot be determined. In one case a naked woman, represented in relief, is squatting at the feet of a clothed figure (L. M. Ugolini, op. cit. 139, fig. 71), which in this case seems likewise to represent a deity.

⁶⁹ A. Mayr, op. cit. 7, 361; Th. Zammit, op. cit. 36 f.

⁷⁰ A. Mayr, op. cit. 362 f.; *Abhandl.* 1901, 690 f.; L. M. Ugolini, op. cit. 195.

⁷¹ A. Mayr, *Abhandl.* 1901, 685; Pl. IX, 2.

⁷² *Welt als Geschichte* 2, 7.

⁷³ A. Taramelli and F. Nissardi, *Mon. Linc.* 18, 114; A. Taramelli, *Memnon* 2, 28; G. G. Porro, *Atene e Roma* 18, 156; F. Giarizzo, *Boll. paleont. Ital.* 48, 46 f.

⁷⁴ C. Schuchhardt, *SBBA.* 1929, 437 f.; *D. Burg im Wandel der Weltgesch.* 54 f.; *Anlike* 9, 305. The example of a Nuraghe, which is the fortified centre of a village settlement of serfs, is supplied by Palmavera and Losa (*Convegno archeol. di Sardegna* 1926, 38, fig. 41).

On fortresses of nobles in Greece, see M. Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* 2, 555; cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, *SBBA*. 1906, 63 n. 4.

⁷⁵ Spanish parallels in P. Bosch-Gimpera, *25 Jahre Röm.-German. Kommiss.* 84.

⁷⁶ K. Kerényi reminds me of the ideal tower in Shelley's *Epipsy-chidion*, which Th. A. Huxley contrasted with a rational renaissance building in classical style:

Seems not a work of human art,
But as it were titanic, in the heart
Of the earth having assumed its form and grown
Out of the mountain, from the living stone.

⁷⁷ For an attempt to distinguish periods and give a date, cp. W. v. Bissing, *Röm. Mitt.* 43, 19 f.; in relation to him A. Taramelli, *Mon. Linc.* 34, 118, and C. Albizzati, *Historia* 3, 380 f.; a reply by W. Bissing, *Röm. Mitt.* 45, 234 f. Fresh discoveries of recent years from Teti Abini in A. Taramelli, *Nsc.* 1931, 35 f.; W. Technau, *Arch. Anz.* 1932, 515 f.; the older material in a convenient form in Taramelli's *Guida del museo di Cagliari*. The attempt to evaluate the art has not yet been made, not even in R. B. Bandinelli's essay in *Cahiers d'art* 1930, 501 f.

⁷⁸ H. Schäfer, *Antike* 3, 258.

⁷⁹ R. B. Bandinelli, op. cit. 507 fig. 13a.

⁸⁰ Cp. *Mon. Linc.* 34, 26, fig. 15; *Nsc.* 1931, 84; *Att. Linc.* 1910, 106; *Mon. Linc.* 23, 895; *Nsc.* 1909, 421, with H. Schäfer, op. cit. 210, Abb. 25-6; L. Curtius, *Antike Kunst* I, 169 Abb. 12.

⁸¹ L. Curtius, op. cit. 2, 60 f.; M. Rostovtzeff's recent observations on the art of Palmyra (*Yale Class. Studies* 5, 235 f.) are on general principles apposite.

⁸² L. Curtius, op. cit. 2, 46.

⁸³ For the setting in of the new element cp. H. Schweitzer, *Gnomon* 10, 345; also some remarks on the epochal importance of the event, 338 f.

⁸⁴ H. Schweitzer, *Herakles* 59 f.

⁸⁵ R. Pettazzoni, *La relig. primit. in Sardegna* 38 f. (where, on p. 57 f. a view divergent from the following is proposed); R. B. Bandinelli, op. cit. 509, fig. 18 a-b.

⁸⁶ Of fundamental importance is still R. Pettazzoni's book, quoted above.

⁸⁷ Cp. below, pp. 64 f.

⁸⁸ A. Taramelli, *Mon. Linc.* 34, 34 f.; *Boll. paleoetn. Ital.* 52, 41 f.; A. Evans, *The Palace of Minos* I, 437 f.; fig. 314 f.

⁸⁹ A. Taramelli, *Nsc.* 1932, 528 f.

⁹⁰ A. Taramelli, op. cit. 530.

⁹¹ F. L. Myres, *Ann. Brit. School Ath.* 9, 356 f.; A. Evans, *The palace of Minos* I, 151 f.; M. P. Nilsson, *The Minoan-Mycenean Religion* 62 f.

⁹² A. Taramelli, *Mon. Linc.* 24, 633 f.; *Nsc.* 1931, 64, fig. 21; F. v. Duhn, *Arch. Anz.* 1921, 210 f.; *Ital. Gräberkde.* I, 102.

⁹³ A passage or stairs in front at S. Vittoria di Serri (a spring-shrine) and in similar places: A. Taramelli, *Mon. Linc.* 23, 829 f., and R. Pettazzoni, op. cit. 19 f.; similarly in *Mon. Linc.* 34, 50, fig. 31.

⁹⁴ Cp. *Mon. Linc.* 34, 98 f., figs. 62-6; *ibid.* 24, 657-8, fig. 13;

677-8, fig. 25; A. de la Marmora, *Voyage en Sardaigne*, *Atl. 2. voyage* pl. XIV, fig. 17; text p. 91 f.

⁹⁶ C. Schuchhardt, *Alteuropa*³ pl. XVII; *Die Burg* &c. 63 f., fig. 58-9; V. K. Müller, *Athen. Mitt.* 42, 111 f.

⁹⁶ V. K. Müller, *op. cit.* 110, 112.

⁹⁷ An analogy is offered by certain family-castles in the circle of the Syrtis (in North Africa), which L. Frobenius has discussed: *Das Unbekannte Afrika* 95-8; cp. also P. Bosch-Gimpera, *Etnologia de la península Ibérica* 95. Material and construction are, it is true, different, but here, too, the comparison with the cells and web of a beehive forces itself on the notice. In this case above all it is proved that such a building lodged a community of blood-relations.

⁹⁸ A collection of the material known to him is given by F. v. Duhn, *Reallex. d. Vorgesch.* 3, 225 f.

⁹⁹ E. Norden, *Altgermanien* 238 f.

¹⁰⁰ E. Kornemann, quoted by E. Norden, *op. cit.* 252.

¹⁰¹ For a criticism see K. Kerényi, *Revue des études Balkaniques* 1936, 19 f.

¹⁰² E. Norden, *op. cit.* 245; the judgment of E. Pernice in n. 8.

¹⁰³ A. Köster, *Klio, Beiheft* 32, 114 f.; in agreement with him C. Schuchhardt, *Alteuropa*³, 209 f. O. Almgren, *Felszeichn. als relig. Urk.* 1 f., thinks that these ships are sacred objects, again in contrast to Norden's interpretation of the ships on the Novilara 'stelae'.

¹⁰⁴ E. Norden, *op. cit.* 248.

¹⁰⁵ E. Norden, *op. cit.* 247 f.

¹⁰⁶ H. Payne, *Necrocorinthia* (1931), offers much material for comparison, as Norden has already seen. The closest parallel in its movement is pl. 30, 8 (Middle Corinthian).

¹⁰⁷ H. Payne, *op. cit.* 117, fig. 43; also 116 n. 9; 208 f., figs. 94 and 95.

¹⁰⁸ H. Payne, *op. cit.* 107, fig. 37; pl. 40, 3.

¹⁰⁹ Analogies of drawing in *Reallex. d. Vorgesch.* 3, pl. 25 a and c.

¹¹⁰ *Arch. Jahrb.* 1921, 39 f., figs. 6 and 7.

¹¹¹ See below, pp. 64, 158 f.

¹¹² Especially noticeable on the lower and on the left border.

¹¹³ E. Norden, *op. cit.* 243 n. 1, referring to O. Montelius, *Die vorklassische Chronologie Italiens* 17.

¹¹⁴ As yet unpublished.

¹¹⁵ Latest works: G. Marro, *Atti della R. Acad. di Torino*, vol. 52, 1932; R. Battaglia, *Nsc.* 1933, 201 f.; *Studi Etruschi* 8, 11 f.; the latest finds in E. Trautmann, *Welt als Geschichte* 2, 83 f.

¹¹⁶ Nacquane; still unpublished.

¹¹⁷ A. Taramelli, *Guida del museo di Cagliari* fig. 35; M. Rostovtzeff, *Yale Class. Studies* 5, 231 n. 104.

¹¹⁸ H. Kühn, *IPEK.* 1932-3, 150; 1934, 160; R. Battaglia, *Studi Etruschi* 8, 27 f., where later stages are also treated.

¹¹⁹ H. Nissen, *Ital. Landeskunde* I, 189; also J. Whatmough, *The Preitalic dialects* 2, 3 f., 59 f.

¹²⁰ H. Nissen, *op. cit.* 2, 486 n. 5.

¹²¹ F. Messerschmidt, *Bronzezeit und Eisenzeit in Italien* 49.

¹²² G. Ghirardini, *Nsc.* 1905, 289 f.; F. Messerschmidt, *op. cit.* 49.

¹²³ F. Messerschmidt, *op. cit.* 49, where further literature is quoted.

- ¹²⁴ Op. cit. 158 n. 1.
- ¹²⁵ R. Battaglia, op. cit. 8, 30.
- ¹²⁶ R. Battaglia, op. cit. 8, pl. VII, 2; cp. also 1.
- ¹²⁷ H. Payne, op. cit., 71 f., fig. 17-19.
- ¹²⁸ B. D. Filow, *D. archaische Nekropole von Trebenischte* pl. V, 7.
- ¹²⁹ R. Battaglia, *Studi Etruschi* 7, 11 f.
- ¹³⁰ R. Battaglia, *ibid.* 8, 47 f.
- ¹³¹ The literature in F. v. Duhn, op. cit. 8, 226, and O. Almgreen, op. cit. 264 f.
- ¹³² R. Battaglia, op. cit. 8, 41 f.; those very representations of bulls and those *recinti*, on whose rare occurrence at Val Camonica he lays stress, are now known to us in new and very imposing finds.
- ¹³³ H. Nissen, op. cit. 1, 486.
- ¹³⁴ E. Norden, op. cit. 158, n. 1; B. G. Niebuhr, *Röm. Gesch.* I², 181.
- ¹³⁵ B. G. Niebuhr, op. cit. I², 182.
- ¹³⁶ A. Taramelli, op. cit. fig. 81.
- ¹³⁷ Most recently H. Krahe in the *Festschrift Hirt* 2, 271; J. Whatmough, op. cit. 2, 147 f., 154 f.; F. Specht, *K.Z.* 62, 215.
- ¹³⁸ Most recently P. Graziosi, *IPEK.* 8, 26 f.
- ¹³⁹ C. Schuchhardt, op. cit. 201. I hope to deal in another place with the chronological relationship of the rock-engravings of the ancient North (O. Almgreen, op. cit. p. xi and 360 f.) and those of Val Camonica.
- ¹⁴⁰ L. Frobenius, *Kulturgeschichte Afrikas* 50 f.; Frobenius-Obermaier, *Hadschra Maktuba* 25 f., 58 f.
- ¹⁴¹ O. Almgreen, op. cit. 229 f. The pictures from Val Camonica are still unpublished.
- ¹⁴² The name already occurs in Stesichorus: O. Jahn, *Bilderchroniken* 68.
- ¹⁴³ Cp. U. V. Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 84, 814; E. Tabeling, *Mater Larum* 96 n. 2; W. Hoffmann, *Rom und die griechische Welt*, 109 f., 120 f., 124. As against interpretations of a different tenor (most recently B. Rehm, *Philol. Suppl.* 24, 2, 29 n. 65) we must remember that at this point an original island-form of Cape Circeii is not implied. It lies *μύχῳ ῥήσῳ ἰσθάων*, as Mycenae lies *μύχῳ Ἀγρόως*. It is in the middle, then, of a ring of islands, which welcomes the seafarer coming from Cyme: Procida and Ischia, Ventotene, S. Stefano and the Pontian group. One needs to have seen the district for oneself and then the right explanation forces itself on one.
- ¹⁴⁴ On the shrine of Circe and the finds made there, cp. G. Lugli, *Forma Italica, Reg. I*, 1, 2, 28 f.; *Nsc.* 1930, 542; *Arch. Anz.* 1931, 660.
- ¹⁴⁵ G. Lugli, op. cit. figs. 83-4.
- ¹⁴⁶ Theophrastus, *h. pl.* 5, 8, 8; Verg., *Aen.* 7, 11, and Servius on that passage.
- ¹⁴⁷ Here belongs her connexion with magic herbs (Plin., *n. h.* 25, 10 f.), but above all the Etruscan story of the sorceress (*φαρμακς*) and handmaid of Circe, Hals, at whose abode Odysseus dies, transformed into a horse (Ptolem. Hephaist. in Phot., *bibl. C.* 190, p. 150 a 15 B; op. Müller-Decke, *D. Etrusker* 2, 283 n. 13, and Drexler, *Roschers Myth. Lex.* I, 1823 f.). The story is spun out of the Odyssey, but still it shows in the horse as personification of the dead (L. Malten, *Arch. Jahrb.* 1914, 214 f.) a genuine ancient trait.
- ¹⁴⁸ Suggestion from K. Kerényi.

¹⁴⁹ On the questions connected with this, see most recently P. Orsi, *Templum Apollinis Alaei* 171 f.

¹⁵⁰ C. Koch, *Gestirnverehrung im alten Italien* 101 f.

¹⁵¹ Cp. below, p. 298.

¹⁵² L. Malten, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 29, 50.

¹⁵³ E. Kantorowicz, *Friedrich II* 630.

¹⁵⁴ E. Fraenkel, *Gedanken zu einer deutschen Vergilfeier* 25.

¹⁵⁵ A similar report in Ovid, *fast.* 4, 652 f., of the oracle of Faunus, only that the questioner must also sleep on the skin. More still in Eitrem, *RE.* 5A, 869.

¹⁵⁶ H. Nissen, *Italische Landeskunde* 2, 837 f.; Weiss, *RE.* 7, 756; G. Gianelli, *Culti e miti della Magna Grecia* 110; M. Mayer, *Apulien* 354 f.

¹⁵⁷ Finds of the 'extraterramaricoli' culture from the Coppa Navigata near Manfredonia, A. Mosso, *Mon. Linc.* 19, 305 f.; finds of religious character, 364 f.; cp. v. Duhn, *Reallex. d. Vorgesch.* 2, 322 f.; F. Messerschmidt, *Bronzezeit und frühe Eisenzeit* 50.

¹⁵⁸ *Guida D' Italia* dal T. C. I., *Italia Meridionale* I (1926, 841 f.).

¹⁵⁹ Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altert.* 2, 483.

¹⁶⁰ For the following, as for the fourth section, I am indebted to H. Koch for important suggestions.

¹⁶¹ Cp. the detailed narrative in K. Ziegler, *RE.* 16, 2066 f.

¹⁶² K. Ziegler, *RE.* 7, 947 f.; cp. H. Payne, *Necrocorinthia* 5 n. 1.

¹⁶³ O. Brendel, *Arch. Anz.* 1934, 483; P. Lancani-Montuoro, *ibid.* 1936, 512 f.

¹⁶⁴ A specimen is given by V. Spinazzola, *Le arti decorative in Pompei* pl. I f.

¹⁶⁵ Pointed out to me by K. Kerényi.

¹⁶⁶ K. Kuruniotis, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 32, 56 f., 59 f.

¹⁶⁷ W. F. Otto, *Die Götter Griechenlands* 33; U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* I, 212.

¹⁶⁸ O. Brendel, *op. cit.* 488 f.

¹⁶⁹ W. Böhringer, *Arch. Anz.* 1928, 176; *Boll. stud. medit.*, I (1980), part 1, 26.

¹⁷⁰ A. Maiuri, *Historia* 4, 62.

¹⁷¹ W. Technau, *Arch. Anz.* 1930, 381.

¹⁷² J. Geffcken, *Timaos Geogr. d. Westens* 145; further evidence in E. Norden's commentary on *Aeneid* VI², 133 f.

¹⁷³ O. Brendel, *Arch. Anz.* 1933, 633 f.

¹⁷⁴ As such she is conceived as cowering on the ground, as the base of Surrentum shows: *Ausonia* 3, 94 f., fig. 1; cp. A. Möbius, *Athen. Mitt.* 1916, 218.

¹⁷⁵ A. Gabrici, *Mon. Linc.* 22, 61 f.; A. Maiuri, *Historia* 4, 61 f.; W. Technau, *Arch. Anz.* 1930, 380.

¹⁷⁶ In the first place we shall have to think of a female companion of the prophetic god Fatuus, who has appeared on an Oscan dedicatory inscription from Aeclanum in the territory of the Hirpini: J. Sgobbo, *Nsc.* 1930, 400 f. The *Campi Arusini*, where Pyrrhus, in the tradition of Livy, was defeated in 275 B.C. (K. J. Beloch, *Röm. Gesch.* 466 f.; H. Krahe, *Idg. Forsch.* 53, 71 f.), lay, according to Fronto (*Strateg.* 4, 1, 14), near a city Statuentum or Fatuentum; here, too, is concealed the name of the Oscan Fatuus or his consort.

¹⁷⁷ Rightly emphasized by L. Malten, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 29,

37. I cannot here discuss the objections raised by W. Hoffmann, *Wandel und Herkunft d. Sibyllin. Bücher in Rom* (Leipz. Diss., 1933); I was not convinced by them. Cp., too, W. Kroll, *Gnomon* 10, 888.

¹⁷⁸ L. Malten, op. cit. 37.

¹⁷⁹ Whereas the Sibylline Books had entered Rome about the turn of the sixth to fifth century and had received their fixed place in the temple of Capitoline Jupiter, an individual temple was not built to the god till 481 (G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 294 f.). If an *Apollinar* occurs even earlier (cp. author, *GG.* 102), that only shows that the god did indeed come to Rome in the company of the books, but that it was only subsequently that he acquired importance.

¹⁸⁰ L. Malten, op. cit. 83 f.

¹⁸¹ P. Kretschmer, *Einlgt. i. d. Gesch. d. griech. Sprache* 280 f.; A. v. Blumenthal, *Hesychstud.* 42 f.

¹⁸² U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* I, 69; cp. the works of A. v. Blumenthal quoted here.

¹⁸³ Cp. below, p. 41.

¹⁸⁴ A. v. Blumenthal points out to me that *Libera* received particularly intensive worship in the ancient Illyrian field (cp. G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 303 n. 7; Rosch. *Myth. Lex.* 2, 2027). Since, then, the ancient worship of Dionysos by Illyrian tribes is assured (Hesych. s. v. *Διάλογος*), here must lie, merely hidden by Roman transformation and renaming, an ancient divine pair, Dionysos and his female consort. This guess has been confirmed by the discovery of a Venetian *Libera* (*louzera*, S. E. Johnson, *The Prae-Italic Dial.* I, 758 no. 162; 163 f.), the more so as the undoubted connexion of the naming of children as *liberi* with the name of the god recurs among the Venetians (*louzeroqos*, 'liberis', dat. plur.). We find, then, for this divine pair a region of worship stretching from central Italy to Illyria. I trust, then, that others than myself will question the complete denial of the goddess *Ἐλευθέρα* (U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 2, 284 n. 2), whom I have postulated as a counterpart to *Ἐλευθερος*—Liber and as eponymous deity of *Ἐλευθεροί* (*TM.* 26 f.).

¹⁸⁵ Cp. author, *GG.* 4 f. and below, p. 243 ff.

¹⁸⁶ M. Hammerström, *Studi Etruschi* 5, 363 f.; cp. S. P. Cortsen, *Glotta* 23, 157 f.

¹⁸⁷ K. Meister, *Griech.-Latein. Eigennam.* I, 113 f.; E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica* I, 61 f.; P. Von der Mühl, *D. grosse Aias* 31 n. 74.

¹⁸⁸ Author, *GG.* 20 f., 38 f.; M. P. Nilsson, *Gnomon*, 12, 44 f.; A. D. Nock, *Amer. Journ. Phil.* 1936, 344 f.

¹⁸⁹ For all details cp. below, pp. 88 f.

¹⁹⁰ Cp. Author, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 29, 22 f.; B. Rehm questions this (op. cit. 95 n. 189a; E. Lamer, *Philol. Wochenschrift* 1932, 430 f.), on what appear to me to be insufficient grounds. On the Illyrian *ap-* 'water' see now H. Krahe, *Glotta* 20, 186 f., but cp. also *Zeitschr. f. Ortsnamenf.* 18, 21 f. Of great importance is the agreement of the legend of Camilla with the youthful story of Pyrrhus, to which U. v. Wilamowitz has called attention, *Griech. Heldensage* 2, 229. I should not, however, find the connexion in literary borrowing, but in a common Illyrian saga.

¹⁹¹ We may quote in evidence the works of A. v. Blumenthal, especially his studies of Hesychius; cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* I, 69 n. 4.

¹⁹² B. D. Filow, *D. archaische Nekropole von Trebenischle* (1927).

¹⁹³ A. Pernice, *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1929, 439 f.; U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. I, 69, 309; E. Fabricius, *Ephem. arch.* 1927-8, 47 f.; Ed. Norden, *Altgermanien* 246 n. 1, 269 f.; C. Schuchhardt, *Antike* 9, 306 f.; *Alteuropa*³ 253, 285, where passing reference is made to the finds of Kl. Glein at Graz.

¹⁹⁴ He appears on a 'ceremonial staircase' at Tarquinii, illustrated by A. della Seta, *Italia antica*² 238, fig. 253. See further B. Schweitzer, *Gnomon* 4, 190 f.; 10, 349, and U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* I, 125, where the older literature may be found; cp. also *Arch. Anz.* 1931, 450 Abb. 13 high right, and E. Langlotz, *Antike* 8, 177.

¹⁹⁵ Cp. Author, *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* 8, 149 f., where reference is made to a newly discovered dedicatory inscription of highly archaic character from Veii.

¹⁹⁶ Collection of the material in *GG.* 167 f.

¹⁹⁷ Summarized in G. Karo, *Athen. Mitt.* 45, 106 f.; P. Ducati, *Storia dell' arte etrusca* 2, pl. 28 f.; F. v. Duhn, *Ital. Gräberkunde* 1, 208 f., 490 f.; H. Mühlestein, *Die Kunst d. Etrusker* I (there, p. 130 f., an exhaustive list of literature).—Vetulonia; G. Karo, in Milani's *Studi e materiali* I, 235 f.; 2, 97 f.; on Marsiliana d' Albegna, see the book of that name by A. Minto (Florence, 1921); T. Regolini-Galassi; G. Pinza, *Materiali per la etnologia antica Toscano-Laziale* I; Praeneste: C. D. Curtis, *Memor. Amer. Acad. Rome*, vols. III and V.

¹⁹⁸ W. Technau, *Arch. Anz.* 1930, 380.

¹⁹⁹ E. Gâbrici, *Mon. Linc.* 22, 343 f.; A. Rumpf, *Einltg. in. d. Altertumswiss.* II, 3, 5; H. Payne, *Necrocorinthia* 4, especially n. 2, 8.

²⁰⁰ The comparison with religion forces itself on one: U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 2, 9 f.

²⁰¹ H. Payne, op. cit. 9 f.

²⁰² Author, *GG.* 182 f.; the evidence in Wissowa, *RE. Suppl.* I, 340; H. Payne, op. cit. 219 and 250 n. 1; A. Blakeway, *Journ. Rom. stud.* 1935, 129 f.

²⁰³ H. Koch, *Röm. Mitt.* 1915, 96; cp. *Athen. Mitt.* 1914, 167, and H. Payne, op. cit. 256, fig. 108 B.

²⁰⁴ H. Koch, *Athen. Mitt.* 1914, 237 f.

²⁰⁵ Paulsen-Rhomaïos, *Erster vorläuf. Bericht über die dänisch-griechischen Ausgrab. in Katydon* (Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. 14, 3), 21 f., fig. 30 f.; H. Payne, op. cit. 249 f.

²⁰⁶ Poulsen-Rhomaïos, op. cit. fig. 33, 34, 43; H. Koch, *Dachterrakotten aus Kampanien* I, 20 f.; pl. II, 3.

²⁰⁷ H. Koch, op. cit. 15 f.—p. 15, fig. 18, is a further development of E. Douglas van Buren, *Greek Fictile Revetments in the Archaic Period XXII*, fig. 70; H. Payne, op. cit. 250, fig. 106; cp. 252 n. 6. The breadth of Corinth's commerce is shown not only by imports from Attica and Laconia, but also from Etruria. The *bucchero* ware, manufactured in Central Italy, is being found in Perachora, a little north of the Isthmus of Corinth. Cp. *Brit. Arch. Discoveries in Greece and Crete, 1886-1936*, 60 f.

²⁰⁸ *Arch. Anz.* 1934, 485-6, Abb. 22.

²⁰⁹ O. Brendel, *ibid.* 487

²¹⁰ O. Brendel, op. cit. 487; E. Pfuhl, *Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen* 492; H. Payne, *Ann. Brit. School Ath.* 27, 180 f.

²¹¹ F. Matz in Th. Bossert, *Gesch. d. Kunstgewerbes* I, 194 f.; cp. Abb. p. 193, 2.

²¹² F. Matz, op. cit. 206.

²¹³ Apart from the familiar pieces, such as the pectoral and the bracelets from the tomb Regolini-Galassi in Caere, I refer to the bronze shield from a grave in Narce, now in the Villa Giulia (*Photo Anderson* 6324).

²¹⁴ F. Matz, op. cit. 208, 212.

²¹⁵ On the present state of the much debated question of the alphabet, E. Fiesel is instructive; cp. *Etruskisch* (*Gesch. d. indog. Sprachwiss.* II. 5, 4), 37 f., 55 f. Additions in F. Thurneysen, *Glotta* 21, 2 f.; P. Kretschmer, *ibid.* 159 f.

²¹⁶ On the question of date, see now G. Pasquali, *Preistoria della poesia Romana* 61 n. 2.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

¹ C. Schuchhardt, *Altewropa*³ 125 f.

² C. Schuchhardt, op. cit. 134.

³ On the following section see the general remarks of W. F. Otto, *Die Götter Griechenlands* 32 f., 178 f.

⁴ L. Malten, *Röm. Mitt.* 38, 317 f.; cp. author, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 27, 35 f.; *TM.* 48 f.

⁵ L. Malten, op. cit. 300 f., 329.

⁶ G. Karo, *Antike* 1, 229 f.

⁷ R. Mengarelli, *Studi etruschi* 1, 163 f.

⁸ E. Brizio, *Mon. Linc.* I, 249 f.; P. Ducati, *Etruria antica* 2, 92 f.; *Storia dell' arte etrusca* 2, pl. 25-6; *Storia di Bologna* I, 194 f.

⁹ F. de Ruyt, *Charun, démon étrusque* 241 f.

¹⁰ C. van Essen, *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* 4, 286 f.; *Atti del 1. Congr. intern. etrusco* 117 f.; *Klio* 23, 147 f.

¹¹ F. de Ruyt, op. cit. 180 f.

¹² F. de Ruyt, op. cit. 241 f.

¹³ C. O. Thulin, *Die Götter des Martianus Capella* (*RGVV.* 3, 1), 35; G. Körte, *Röm. Mitt.* 20, 374 f.; G. Furlani, *Atti del 1. Congr. internat. etrusco* 122 f.; B. Nogara, *Gli Etruschi e la loro civiltà* 158 f.

¹⁴ A. Jeremias, *Handb. d. altoriental. Geistesku.*³ 261 f.

¹⁵ G. Körte, op. cit. 370.

¹⁶ G. Körte, op. cit. 378 f.; pl. XIV; cp. too the Vatican mirror and the Calchas examining a liver on it (B. Nogara, op. cit. 193 f., fig. 114).

¹⁷ *RuKdR*³ 111.

¹⁸ *Die Stellung der Frau i. d. vorgriech. Mittelmeerkultur* 34 f.

¹⁹ M. Halberstadt, *Mater Matuta* (*Frankf. Stud.* 8).

²⁰ L. Euing, *Die Sage von Tanaquil* (*Frankf. Stud.* 2).

²¹ L. Frobenius, *D. Unbekannte Afrika* 76; *Monumenta Africana* 473 f., 477 f.

²² For all further details I must refer to the literature; Müller-Deecke, *D. Etrusker* 1, 376 f.; E. Lattes, *Le iscrizioni latine con metronimico di provenienza etrusca* (*Memor. R. Acad. Napoli* 1896); G. Körte, *RE.* 8, 754 f.; P. Ducati, *Etruria* 1, 48; P. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 2, 212; G. Herbig in L. Wenger, *Miscell. Ehrle* 2, 11; E.

Kornemann, op. cit. 36 n. 90; W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 321; J. Martha in Daremberg-Saglio, *s. v. Etrusci* 822. A recent find in *Nsc.* 1933, 42, other examples: *CIL.* 1² 2, fasc. 2, p. 829, left column, l. 18 from top and following.

²¹ L. Wenger, op. cit. 11 f.; E. Lattes, *Atene e Roma* 5, 529 f.—The case is different again in Roman Africa. There, if a native marries a Roman woman, the children bear the name of the mother in opposition to Roman custom. It was because she belonged to the ruling people. Cp. *CIL.* 8, *Suppl.* 1, 1308; A. Schulten, *Das röm. Afrika* 26.

²² A. Lehrs, *De Aristarchi arte gramm.*² 175.

²³ A. Usener, *Götternamen* 224 n. 65.

²⁴ On the form of name, cp. W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 165.

²⁵ Author, *TM.* 102 f.

²⁶ H. Usener, *Rhein. Mus.* 58, 185; P. Vonder Mühl, *D. grosse Aias* 17 f.

²⁷ F. Weege, *Malerei d. Etrusk.*, pl. 61; *Monum. dell' Inst.* 9, pl. 15; E. Douglas van Buren, *Figurative terracotta revetments in Etruria and Latium* pl. XVIII, fig. 1.

²⁸ W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 165.

²⁹ U. v. Wilamowitz, *Staat und Gesellschaft der Griechen* 33.

³⁰ Most recently U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 324.

³¹ Most recently U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 1, 324; 2, 30.

³² E. Szanto, *Ausgew. Abhandl.* (edited by Swoboda), 136 f.; J. Sundwall, *D. einheimischen Namen der Lykier* 257 f.; cp. O. A. Danielsson, *Gött. gel. Anz.* 178 (1916), 490 f.; E. Kornemann, op. cit. 23 f.; H. Graillot, *Le culte de Cybèle* 5 f., 365 f.; A. Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics* 1, 136. For an agreement between Lydian and Etruscan custom cp. C. Clemen, *Die Religion der Etrusker* 6.

³³ On the following section, cp. L. Frobenius, *Monum. Africana* 473 f.

³⁴ *Nsc.* 1915, 347 f.

³⁵ R. Mengarelli, op. cit. 363.

³⁶ R. Mengarelli, op. cit. 357 f.

³⁷ Fig. 11, 14, 17.

³⁸ Fig. 11, 12, 14.

³⁹ Literature in *GG.* 69 n. 2; cp. G. B. Giornale, *Boll. commun.* 57, 249 f.; *Arch. Jahrb.* 1930, 69 Abb. 6; *Bildertafeln des Etrusk. Mus. Ny-Carlsberg* 75 f., 83; S. Aurigemma, *Il R. Museo di Spina* 46, pl. XXIII (Spina had an Etruscan element in its population, op. cit. 12).

⁴⁰ Müller-Deecke, *D. Etrusker* 2, 266 n. 59 b.; A. Dieterich, *Mutter Erde*² 104; E. Pfuhl, *Arch. Jahrb.* 1905, 91; R. Bandinelli, *Mon. Linc.* 30, 477 f.; L. Curtius, *Festschrift L. Klages* 22 Abb. 4, 23.

⁴¹ *CIL.* 1² 2, 2497, 'phallus tuenia cinctus'.

⁴² Literature in *GG.* 68 n. 3.

⁴³ U. v. Wilamowitz, *Staat u. Gesellschaft* 45; *Pindaros* 356; V. Ehrenberg, *Einlfg. i. d. Altertumswiss.* III² 23.

⁴⁴ E. Boissacq, *Dictionn. de l' étym. gr.*² 986.

⁴⁵ U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 69 f.

⁴⁶ A. Christensen, *L'empire des Sassanides* 23 f., where the older literature is quoted (information from H. Lommel).

⁴⁷ U. v. Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* 353 f.

⁴⁰ The supposed matriarchy among the Locrians has been last treated by Oldfather, *RE.* 13, 1255 f., and, in connexion with his work, by E. Kornemann, *op. cit.* 25 f.; *cp.* also L. Wenger, *op. cit.* 10 n. 1. For all Oldfather's brilliance, I cannot admit that succession through the mother is proved in a single case for the Locrians. Everywhere we have to deal with the already mentioned ancestresses and only with them; the stone, *IG.* IX, 1, 1071, remains a unicum and as regards the *εὐγένεια* of the women that certainly existed we shall only come to understand it when we can advance towards a solution of the question of the Locrian maidens and others indissolubly connected with it (but *cp.* P. Vonder Mühl, *D. grosse Aias* 35 n. 90). On the Leleges *cp.* U. v. Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* 355.

⁶⁰ Apart from the well-known examples of Bologna and Satricum *cp.*, too, *Boll. paleoetn.* Ital. 52, pl. II below (rock-pictures from Val Camonica) and a bronze funeral urn in the form of a house from Falerii (*Museo di Villa Giulia*, Rome).

⁶¹ F. Schachermeyr, *Etrusk. Frühgesch.* 174; R. Mengarelli, *Studi etruschi* 1, 147 f.

⁶² R. Mengarelli, *Nsc.* 1915, 363 n. 1.

⁶³ R. Mengarelli, *Studi etruschi* 1, 160, 164 below.

⁶⁴ W. F. Otto, *Die Götter Griechenlands* 42; U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 159 n. 2, on the grave phallus 160.

⁶⁵ L. Wenger, *op. cit.* 6.

⁶⁶ W. F. Otto, *Die Manen* 61 f.

⁶⁷ W. F. Otto, *Die Götter Griechenlands* 24 f.

⁶⁸ *Cp.* *δυναμος* 605; *μητρός ἐν αἵματι* 606; *μητρός αἷμα φίλατον* 608.

⁶⁹ What we say here about mother and father is repeated on a higher plane in the relation of family and state; the family, too, is only the caretaker and nurse of the citizen entrusted to it. The saying of a contemporary that the state tears males in their sixth year from their families, to return them at the age of sixty, might be applied to almost any ancient community.

⁷⁰ W. F. Otto, *op. cit.* 27.

⁷¹ *Cp.* below, p. 169.

⁷² On the following section *cp.* *CIE.* 8036 f.; G. Herbig, *Glotta* 5, 241 f.; 12, 234; author, *GG.* 44 f.. Important additions are made by K. Kerényi, *Glotta* 27, 40; against the 'genius as phallus with all that that implies' is U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 2, 232 n. 1.

⁷³ H. Herter, *Rhein. Mus.* 1927, 418 f.; *De Priapo* 299 n. 1; R. Thurneysen, *Rhein. Mus.* 1928, 335; author, *GG.* 53 f.; Vahlert, *RE.* 4 A, 979 f.

⁷⁴ Author, *GG.* 53 f.; *cp.* 47.

⁷⁵ W. F. Otto, *Die Manen* 62.

⁷⁶ F. Weege, *Die Malerei d. Etrusker* pl. 30.

⁷⁷ F. Weege, *op. cit.* pl. 32; *Mem. Amer. Acad. Rome* 6, pl. 2-3.

⁷⁸ F. Weege, *op. cit.* pl. 33.

⁷⁹ Author, *TM.* 138 f., 142 f.; E. Tabeling, *Mater Larum* (Frankf. Forsch. 1), 45 f.

⁸⁰ K. Kerényi, *A Római irodalom szelleme* (Budapest 1932), 8 f., *esp.* 7 f.

⁸¹ H. Usener, *Kl. Schriften* 4, 470; author, *Arch. f. Religionsw.* 27, 39 f.; *TM.* 62 f., 144 f.; K. Kerényi, *Egyetemes Philologiai*

közlöny 55, 73; 57, 9; E. Tabelaing, op. cit. 25 f.; O. Weinreich, *Hermes* 62, 118 n. 2.

⁷² P. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 18, 114 f.

⁷³ P. Kretschmer, *ibid.* 2, 164 f.; E. Kalinka, *Philolog. Woch.* 1922, 571 f.; author, *Arch. f. Religionsw.* 27, 48 f.; *TM.* 54 f.

⁷⁴ K. Kerényi, *Revue des études balkaniques* 8, 19 f.

⁷⁵ The ideas that follow were first published in *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* 10, 125 f.

⁷⁶ On the history of the name and the districts that correspond to it, cp. H. Nissen, *Italische Landesk.* 1³, 57 f.; and his summing up, 86 f.

⁷⁷ B. G. Niebuhr, *Röm. Gesch.* 1³, 17 f.; H. Nissen, op. cit. 1, 60³ f., 64 f.; Lackeit, *RE*, Suppl. 1248; F. Solmsen, *Indog. Eigennamen* 24.

⁷⁸ In the Greek names of the South strip of Bruttium, too, are found memories of the bull; for example, the river Tauris, the Ταυριανὴ χώρα, the *Taurocini*, *Taurianum*, or *Tauroentum*; H. Nissen, op. cit. 2, 960 f.; C. Cichorius, *Röm. Stud.* 86 f.

⁷⁹ B. G. Niebuhr, op. cit. 1³, 16 f.; H. Nissen, op. cit. 1, 68 n. 2, who quotes a few more cases.

⁸⁰ W. Schulze, *Quaest. ep.* 153 f.

⁸¹ *Gli antichi Italici* 115.

⁸² As little as in Greek religion, cp. *Extrem*, *RE* 5A, 865, 869.

⁸³ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 145.

⁸⁴ I would not deny that Bovianum could also mean the city of the *Bovii*, the gens *Bovia* (W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 284, 551; but cp. *Bouavón*: Appian, *civ.* 1, 51). But, if so, this people derived their origin from the bull, as we shall demonstrate in a moment of the *Ital.* The further question arises whether, like Bovianum and like the Latin Vitellia, the city of Bovillae does not express in its name some reference to the divine bull. The most diverse variants occur: *Boitum* (cp. Diod. 7, 5, 9), *Bovellae*, *Bola*, *Bolanus* (W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 538), *Boelius* (W. Schulze, op. cit. 89 n. 5)—but that the form Bovillae and with it the connexion with the bull or ox was the original one may be proved by a comparison with the name of the Campanian Nola.

If we begin with the native Oscan form, **Núvlā* (cp. *Núvlano-* native of Nola, Nolan') might come equally well from **Návilā-* or **Núvelā-* (R. Planta, *Gramm. d. osk-umbr. Dial.* 1, 227). **Núvelā-* has been associated with Latin *novellus*, which, like the connected gentile names *Novellus*, *Novelledius*, Oscan *Núvellum* (R. S. Conway, *The Italic Dialects* 1, 637), shows the form with the *ll*. But **Núvilā*, too, may have had beside it a similar form. We find *pusillus*, *putillus*, *quasillus*, beside *rutillus*, and in Oscan *Afillis*, *Afillius* beside *Opils*, *Opilius* (W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 461 f.). Strangely enough, it has not been noticed that the required form is preserved in Lucilius, *fr.* 117 M. *broccus †novillanus*: *Dente adverso eminiculo hic est Rinoceros* . . . Turnebus tried to cure the corruption by conjecturing *Bovillanus*, and this proposal won the approval of C. Cichorius (*Unters. zu Lucil.* 253 n. 8). However, whether regarded as a word of origin or as a personal name, it fails to satisfy; nor does the proposal of F. Marx, who wishes to read: *Novi <Ae>clani* &c. What we want is the immediate reference to Campania, suggested by Horace's imitation of the scene of the quarrel (*Sat.* 1, 5, 52 f.; cp. E. Fraenkel, *Plautin. im Plaut.* 6, 401 n. 2). We must then restore *broccus Novillanus*,

where the second word corresponds in meaning to Oscan *Núplano* exactly. Whether two connected letters are to be read *tl* or *ll* will in most cases have to be determined by the context. Nearest to our form would stand the name of *Νόλλα Καμπανή*, *CIA.* 2, 3047, the linguistic form of which could then be explained without the help of the Greek (W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 482). Last of all we must ask whether the modern Vitulano, not far from Bovianum, carries the name of the bull within its own; cp. W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 381. Greek parallels in Eitrem, *RE* 5A, 871.

⁸⁵ For details, see below, p. 212 f.; theories about Etruscan *suri* and *Soranus* in S. P. Cortsen, *Glotta* 18, 183 f.; F. Leifer, *Stud. z. antik. Aemterwesen* 1, 204, 208, 263.

⁸⁶ *Glotta* 14, 86. Most recently E. Norden, *Altgermanien* 218, 224 f.

⁸⁷ Cp. pp. 206 ff.

⁸⁸ W. F. Otto, *RE.* 6, 2054 f., 2056 f.

⁸⁹ Cp. pp. 207 f., 218 f., where the older literature is quoted.

⁹⁰ Cp. pp. 212 f.; A. v. Blumenthal, *Zeitschr. f. Ortsnamen-Forsch.* 8, 160. Not only in Apulia appear the Daunii, but also in Campania (Polyb. 3, 91, 5; cp. H. Krahe, *Zeitschr. f. Ortsnam.-forsch.* 8, 155 n. 1) and in Latium (Lycophr., 1254, where we should read *Λατῖνους* with the manuscripts); cp. Vergil., *Aen.* 8, 146; 12, 723 (cp. B. Rehm, *Philol. Suppl.* 24, 2, 28). Lycophron, then, already knew the localization of Daunus in the Latin Ardea.

⁹¹ W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 122 f., 165 f.; W. F. Otto, *Rhein. Mus.* 64, 440 f.; G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 33 n. 3; doubts expressed by H. J. Rose, *Harvard Theolog. Rev.* 27, 48 f.; G. Costa, *Nuova rivista storica* 18, fasc. 1, 7.

⁹² Justinus 48, 1, 7.

⁹³ Cp. p. 213.

⁹⁴ Collected by L. Malten, *Arch. Jahrb.* 1928, 132.

⁹⁵ M. P. Nilsson, *Griech. Feste* 308; W. F. Otto, *Dionysos* 100, 179.

⁹⁶ L. Malten, op. cit. 132; U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 113, 115.

⁹⁷ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 33 n. 1.

⁹⁸ Already in Niebuhr, op. cit. 16.

⁹⁹ F. Münzer, *Röm. Adelspart.* 66 f.

¹⁰⁰ F. Münzer, op. cit. 69 n. 1.

¹⁰¹ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 145 n. 2.

¹⁰² F. Münzer, op. cit. 65.

¹⁰³ Cp. pp. 214 f.; E. Tabeling, *Mater Larum* 95 n. 2.

¹⁰⁴ F. Weege, *Arch. Jahrb.* 24, 156.

¹⁰⁵ F. Weege, op. cit. 106, no. 12.

¹⁰⁶ Illustrated in *Propyläen-Weltgesch.* 2, 265 plate.

¹⁰⁷ F. Weege, op. cit. 142, fig. 16, 3.

¹⁰⁸ The analogous German custom is similarly interpreted by K. Meuli, *D. Deutschen Masken* 104.

¹⁰⁹ On the bronze bull of the house of the Valerii (Dion. Hal. 5, 39, 5), cp. W. F. Otto, *Philol. N. F.* 18, 191.

¹¹⁰ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 142.

¹¹¹ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 144 f.

¹¹² F. Messerschmidt, *Z. Chronol. d. etr. Wandmal.* 32 f., 58.

¹¹³ J. de Wit, *Arch. Jahrb.* 1929, 38 f.; F. Messerschmidt, op. cit. 33.

¹¹⁴ The frieze of the back rooms could only be discussed in a wider context; on the frieze of the Tomba François in Vulci, with its similar contents, cp. now F. Messerschmidt, *Nekrop. v. Vulci* 120 f.

¹¹⁵ Cp. pp. 30, 64, 158 f. M. Hammarström suggests a further reference to the epigram of Luxorius, *Anthol. lat.* 319; *De sarcophago, ubi turpia sculpta fuerunt*.

¹¹⁶ L. A. Milani, *Museo archeol. di Firenze* 2, tav. 80; A. Rumpf, *D. Etrusk. Skulpturen* E. 19-21; pl. 12; *Nsc.* 1931, 227, fig. 22; F. de Wit, op. cit. 38 n. 1.

¹¹⁷ F. Poulsen, *D. Orient u. d. frühgriech. Kunst* 67; L. Malten, op. cit. 123 n. 11.

¹¹⁸ F. de Wit, op. cit. 38 n. 1; A. Garcia y Bellido, *Archivio Español de arte y arqueología* 21, 1 f.

¹¹⁹ *Antike Denkmäl.* 2, pl. 15, 6 7; E. Petersen, *Röm. Mitt.* 9, 269 f.

¹²⁰ A. della Seta, *Museo di Villa Giulia* 1, 256, 297, 340, 419, 451; Helbig-Amelung, *Führer* 2, 322, 326; *Helbig-Museum* 114, 121; *Bildertafeln* 109; *Nsc.* 1922, 212, fig. 3; *Arch. Anz.* 1892, 161; G. Q. Giglioli, *L'arte etrusca* pl. CXXVII, 2, 4.

¹²¹ E. Douglas van Buren, *Figurat. terracotta revetm. in Etruria and Latium* 13 f., pl. V; *Helbig-Museum* 13; *Bildertafeln* 17; A. della Seta, op. cit. 1, 149, 209; *Nsc.* 1922, 207 f., pl. 1; 1924, pl. VIII c; I. de Wit, op. cit. 38 n. 1; H. Koch, *Dachterrakotten aus Kampanien* 1, 48, 70 f., 96; pl. 10, 2; 18, 5; 22, 2; 31, 2.

¹²² F. Matz, *Naturperson. i. d. Griech. Kunst* 95 f.; U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 2, 7; also 1, 92 n. 1, 98, 150, 218. A vessel with a plastic mask of Achelous, Ionian work of the seventh to sixth century from Populonia: *Nsc.* 1934, 363 f., fig. 16.

¹²³ I remember seeing similar pieces in the Villa Giulia and in the Museo Nazionale of Tarquinii. We should also mention the convex, bronze votive shields from the chamber-graves of Tarquinii and its surroundings (Monteromano); they, too, show Achelous. Cp. H. Mühlestein, *Die Kunst d. Etrusker* I, fig. 144 f. (where the literature is quoted in an appendix); Alinari 35541.

¹²⁴ Sarcophagus of Torre S. Severo: Ducati-Giglioli, *Arte etrusca* 162-3.

¹²⁵ So far as I know, no illustration is available. A basis with a bull from a grave in Vulci, *Arch. Anz.* 1929, 82, Abb. 7. Foreparts of bulls, meant to be hung up on walls, supposed to come from Brindisi and assigned to the fourth century, are discussed by E. v. Mercklin, *Arch. Anz.* 1928, 378 f., fig. 93 4. How far they belong here cannot yet be decided. We should also remember that Augustus, according to Suetonius, *Aug.* 5, was born in regione Palati ad capita bubula.

¹²⁶ D. Levi, *Nsc.* 1931, 196 f.; W. Technau, *Arch. Anz.* 1932, 460.

¹²⁷ *Nsc.* 1931, 227, fig. 22.

¹²⁸ P. Ducati, *Storia di Bologna* 1, 135, fig. 75.

¹²⁹ P. Ducati, op. cit. 1, 133 f.; F. Matz, *Gnomon* 12, 409.

¹³⁰ Cp. A. Moortgat, *Bildwerk u. Volkstum Vorderasiens zur Hethiterzeit* 10 f., 29; Kowalezik-Köster, *Dekorative Skulptur* pl. 9, no. 4.

¹³¹ P. Ducati, op. cit. 1, 182 f., fig. 74.

¹³² *Arch. Jahrb.* 1914, 214 f.; cp. E. Tabeling, *Mater Larum* 96.

¹³³ On the following section, cp. author, *RE.* 4 A, 2542 f.

- ¹³⁴ G. Calza, *Nsc.* 1927, 388; L. Wickert, *SBBA.* 1928, 55 f.
- ¹³⁵ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 418 n. 2.
- ¹³⁶ Author, *TM.* 7 f.; cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 2, 337.
- ¹³⁷ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 456 n. 3.
- ¹³⁸ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 536 n. 8.
- ¹³⁹ L. Wickert, op. cit. 56.
- ¹⁴⁰ *Arch. Jahrb.* 1928, 182 f.; cp. also A. Evans, *The Palace of Minos* 3, 230 f.
- ¹⁴¹ Paton-Hicks, *Inscr. of Cos* n. 37; F. Bechtel, *Götting. gel. Nachr.* 1890, 36; B. Laum, *D. Eisengeld d. Spartaner*, 28; cp. also H. v. Prott, *Leges sacrae* 1, 21.
- ¹⁴² F. Bücheler, *Umbrica* 114 f.; *Philipp, RE.* 9, 971.
- ¹⁴³ J. Marthia, *L'art étrusque* 471, fig. 313; Ducati-Giglioli, op. cit. 250, fig. 73.
- ¹⁴⁴ Further guesses in B. Laum, op. cit. 28.
- ¹⁴⁵ An attempt in L. Malten, op. cit. 136 f.
- ¹⁴⁶ L. Malten, op. cit. 90 f.; cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 111 f.; new material in E. Sjöqvist, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 30, 308 f.
- ¹⁴⁷ L. Malten, op. cit. 91; B. Schweitzer, *Gnomon* 10, 350.
- ¹⁴⁸ It is the lasting merit of R. Pettazzoni, *La relig. primit. in Sardegna* 126 f., to have first placed them in this context.
- ¹⁴⁹ C. Bicknell, *The prehistoric rock-engravings in the Italian Maritime Alps* pl. II f.; I found a further piece in the British Museum, to which it had been brought by Bicknell. Further proof in R. Battaglia, *Studi etruschi* 8, 42.
- ¹⁵⁰ R. Battaglia, op. cit. pl. XXII, 47, fig. 3.
- ¹⁵¹ R. Battaglia, op. cit. 42 f.
- ¹⁵² Still unpublished. A single example in *Welt als Geschichte* 2, Abb. 4 (to p. 85).
- ¹⁵³ R. Battaglia, op. cit. pl. XVII, 1.
- ¹⁵⁴ As a further possibility we might consider for the interpretation of the rock-engravings horned (or long-eared) men, like those of the Mycenaean seal-ring, recently published by J. Leslie Shear, *Amer. Journ. Arch.* 1933, 540.
- ¹⁵⁵ F. Matz, *Gnomon* 12, 410.
- ¹⁵⁶ F. v. Duhn, *Reallex. d. Vorgesch.* 6, 102 f.
- ¹⁵⁷ Cp. the pioneer work of a pupil of V. Purvan, V. Dumitrescu, *L'età del ferro nel Piceno* 1929.
- ¹⁵⁸ V. Dumitrescu, op. cit. 38 f., 47 f.
- ¹⁵⁹ V. Dumitrescu, op. cit. 150 f.; cp. 145, fig. 19, no. 18-20.
- ¹⁶⁰ R. Pettazzoni, op. cit. 46 f., fig. 11 12, 50 f., fig. 18; the type is widely diffused, but Picenum is its centre; cp. V. Dumitrescu, op. cit. 450. A corresponding rock-engraving has been found recently at Val Camonica (still unpublished).
- ¹⁶¹ But cp. R. Pettazzoni, op. cit. 52; Val. Müller, *Orient. Lit.-Ztg.* 1925, 785 f.; A. Roes, *Rev. arch.*, 1932, 19 f.; B. Schweitzer, *Gnomon* I, 247. Cp. also *IPEK.* 1926, pl. XXXI, fig. c.
- ¹⁶² V. Dumitrescu, op. cit. 149 f.; cp. 145, fig. 19, no. 17.
- ¹⁶³ V. Dumitrescu, op. cit. 164.
- ¹⁶⁴ L. Malten, op. cit. 127 f.
- ¹⁶⁵ L. Frobenius, *Kulturgesch. Afrikas* 101 f.
- ¹⁶⁶ L. Malten, op. cit. 126 f.; L. Frobenius, *Erythraea* 100 f.

- ¹⁶⁷ Daremberg-Saglio 2, 1438.
- ¹⁶⁸ V. Dumitrescu, op. cit. 162 f.
- ¹⁶⁹ C. Koch, *Gestirnverehrung im alten Italien* (Frankf. Stud. 3).
- ¹⁷⁰ Cp. V. Dumitrescu, op. cit. 164.
- ¹⁷¹ A. Taramelli, *Mon. Linc.* 23, 400; *Guida del Museo di Cagliari* 17; G. Pinza, *Mon. Linc.* 11, pl. X, 4; pl. XIV, 8; R. Pettazzoni, *La relig. primit. in Sardegna* 52, fig. 14 f. A statuette of a bull from Perfugas: *Boll. d'arte* 1925—26, 282.
- ¹⁷² A. Taramelli, *Mon. Linc.* 23, 399, fig. 94.
- ¹⁷³ W. v. Bissing, *Röm. Mitth.* 43, 29 f.; *Guida* 32 f.; cp. 10 below; Crespi, *Bull. arch. sardo* 1884, 21, pl. II, fig. 11; G. Pinza, *Mon. Linc.* 11, 194, fig. 104; F. v. Duhn, *Ital. Gräberk.* I, 101; 105; A. Taramelli, *Nsc.* 1932, 531, and fig. 2.
- ¹⁷⁴ A. Taramelli, *Mon. Linc.* 19, 409, fig. 45 f.; *Guida*, pl. 3, fig. 5; *Convegno archeol. in Sardegna* 1926, 13, fig. 6a; 15, fig. 8; F. v. Duhn, op. cit. 105.
- ¹⁷⁵ A. Taramelli, *Mon. Linc.* 19, 455, fig. 36-7; *Convegno* 16, fig. 9.
- ¹⁷⁶ A. Taramelli, *Mon. Linc.* 23, 853, fig. 26-7; by it are other smaller votive offerings: op. cit. 34, 22, fig. 12; 25, fig. 14a; tav. III. 1-2.
- ¹⁷⁷ A. Taramelli, *Mon. Linc.* 25, 55, fig. 33-5; cp. 63, fig. 4.
- ¹⁷⁸ A. Taramelli, op. cit. 23, 358 f., 399 f.; 25, 56.
- ¹⁷⁹ A. Taramelli, *Mon. Linc.* 23, 405, fig. 96.
- ¹⁸⁰ C. Schuchhardt, *Alteuropa* 56 f.; P. Bosch-Gimpera, *Etnologia de la peninsula Ibérica*, 187 f.
- ¹⁸¹ E. Seeger, *Vorgesch. Steinbauten der Balearen* 83 f.
- ¹⁸² P. Paris, *Revue Archéologique* 30, 138 f.; P. Baur, *Americ. Journ. of archaeol.* 1907, 188, fig. 6; A. Taramelli, *Convegno* 1926, 118, fig. 11; 121 f., fig. 18; *Mon. Linc.* 23, 404; P. Bosch-Gimpera, op. cit. 200, fig. 153, 203; *Studi etruschi* 3, 19 n. 2.
- ¹⁸³ A. Garcia y Bellido, *Archivo español de arte y arqueología* 21, 1 f.; P. Bosch-Gimpera, *25 Jahre röm.-germ. Komm.* 86; 87.
- ¹⁸⁴ South Spanish rock-paintings with the bull: H. Breuil, *Les peintures rupestres* 4, 16, fig. 6; 72, fig. 35; 73, fig. 36; man with bulls' horns: pl. XLI, no. 3 left; p. XII, fig. 3.
- ¹⁸⁵ A. Schulten, *Geschichte v. Numantia* 146; Abb. 9-10; B. Taracena, *IPEK.* 1925, 75 f. As regards the shrines of Malta I should prefer for the moment to reserve judgment. Pictures of the bull there are given by Th. Zammit, *Prehistoric Malta* 25 f., pl. VIII; cp. also pl. VI 2; L. M. Ugolini, *Malta* 60, fig. 31; pl. IX; cp. 110, fig. 67.
- ¹⁸⁶ The form of expression is borrowed from K. Kerényi, *Gnomon* 10, 138.
- ¹⁸⁷ *Mon. Linc.* 23, 401 f., fig. 95.
- ¹⁸⁸ Cp. p. 27.
- ¹⁸⁹ Op. cit. 222 f.
- ¹⁹⁰ L. Lévy-Bruhl, *D. Seele der Primit.* (German translation), 38 f.; A. Alföldi, *Arch. Anz.* 1931, 398 f.
- ¹⁹¹ W. F. Otto, *D. Götter Griechenlands* 37.
- ¹⁹² L. Lévy-Bruhl, op. cit. 43 f.; W. F. Otto, op. cit. 73 f.
- ¹⁹³ *Guida* pl. XXIV, fig. 38; pl. XXV, fig. 37; pl. XXVI, fig. 39; R. Bandinelli, op. cit. 508, fig. 14; 509, fig. 17 ab; 510, figs. 18-20.

- ¹⁸⁴ *Guida* pl. XXVII, fig. 41; R. Bandinelli, op. cit. 509, fig. 16ab; *Mon. Linc.* 28, 401, fig. 95; 34, 25, fig. 14a.
- ¹⁸⁵ A. Taramelli, *Mon. Linc.* 28, 401; G. G. Porro, op. cit. 172.
- ¹⁸⁶ M. P. Nilsson, *Röm. Mitt.* 48, 246.
- ¹⁸⁷ F. R. Schröder (*German.-roman. Monatsschrift* 1934, 182 f.) comes to what are in general principle the same results with reference to the stag-god (and bull-god, p. 208 f.) in the realm of Germans and Celts.
- ¹⁸⁸ G. Karo, *Die mykenischen Schachtgräber* 344 f.; B. Schweitzer, *Gnomon* 4, 178 f.; 176 f.
- ¹⁸⁹ F. Weege, *Die etrusk. Malerei* pl. III f.
- ¹⁹⁰ W. F. Otto, *Dionysos* 96 f., 103.
- ¹⁹¹ They are partly in the Museum, partly on the outside of the Town-hall, or on the Campanile of the Cathedral, and every visitor to Capua will remember them. I cannot, however, find that they have ever been discussed.
- ¹⁹² F. Weege, *Arch. Jahrb.* 1909, 103 f.; pl. VIII.
- ¹⁹³ E. Fraenkel, *Gnomon* 9, 505; *RE. Suppl.* 6, 622.
- ¹⁹⁴ R. M. Peterson, *The Cults of Campania* (*Pap. Amer. Acad. Rome* 1), 388 f.
- ¹⁹⁵ H. Koch, *Röm. Mitt.* 22, 412 f.; pl. X f.; on the question whether a goddess or human mother is represented, cp. op. cit. 428. The fact, to which we shall soon come, that the women carry as many as ten children in swaddling clothes in their arms at the same time, seems to exclude human mothers.
- ¹⁹⁶ On the following section cp. author, *TM.* 95 f.; cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 2, 549 (on 1, 101).
- ¹⁹⁷ Author, *Epochen* 1, 181 n. 94.
- ¹⁹⁸ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 216 f.; H. Diels, *Sibyllin. Blätter* 25, 28 f.
- ¹⁹⁹ H. Koch, op. cit. 415 f.; pl. XII, 1.
- ²⁰⁰ H. Koch, op. cit. pl. X b.
- ²⁰¹ The piece is, so far as I know, unpublished.
- ²⁰² K. Kerényi, *Glotta* 22, 40 f.; *Revue des études Balkaniques* 3, 20 f.
- ²⁰³ This striking explanation of Kerényi's is to be preferred to that quoted by E. Norden, *Allgermanien* 163; I could not verify his quotation.
- ²⁰⁴ K. Kerényi, op. cit. 41.
- ²⁰⁵ On the following section, cp. A. Gnirs, *Pola, ein Führer d. d. antiken Bildwerke* 7 f.; 149, 186 f.; *Istria Praeromana*, especially 113 f.; Hoernes-Menghin, *Urgesch. d. bild. Kunst.* 472 f.; F. v. Duhn, *Reallex. d. Vorgesch.* 3, 474.
- ²⁰⁶ A. Gnirs, *Pola*, 9; on the neighbouring Japydes, cp. Vulic, *RE.* 9, 724 f.; E. Norden, op. cit. 278 f.; 280; 298 f.
- ²⁰⁷ The name is clearly a Celtic one; cp. A. Holder, *Altceltischer Sprachschatz* 1, 1446, under *epo-*.
- ²⁰⁸ W. Buschor, *Athen. Mitt.* 58, 106 n. 1; dated not before the end of the seventh century by B. Tamaro, *Boll. paleoetnol. Ital.* 17, 116 f.
- ²⁰⁹ A. Gnirs, *Istria Praeromana* 114, Abb. 66.
- ²¹⁰ Hoernes-Menghin, op. cit. 474 f.
- ²¹¹ W. Buschor, op. cit. 106 n. 1.
- ²¹² K. Kerényi, *Revue des études Balkaniques* 3, 20.
- ²¹³ F. Marx, *Athen. Mitt.* 10, 177 f.; E. Samter, *Geburt, Hochzeit*

und Tod 9 f.; on the connexion of the Dioscuri with Kalligeneia, cp. H. Usener, *Götternamen*² 128.

²²⁴ I owe the knowledge of the material to L. Frobenius, who, we hope, will publish it some day [see now *Ekade Ektab, die Felsbilder Fezzans* 44 f.]. The piece from Malta is in Th. Zammit, *Prehistoric Malta*, pl. XXVI, 2.

²²⁵ Cp. most recently L. Euing, *Die Sage von Tanaquil* (Frankf. Stud. 2), 85 f., 49 f.

BOOK II

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

¹ For the literature of the cemetery on the Forum we refer once and for all to F. Duhn's *Italischer Gräberkunde* 1, 413 ff. and 458 ff. There is a collection of material on the earliest phases of the development of the city in Inez G. Scott, *Mem. Americ. Acad. Rome* 7, 21 ff.; cp. also F. Matz, *Gnomon* 7, 202.

² Author *TM.* 116 f.

³ Cp. P. Wolters, *Festschr. Loeb* 119 f.

⁴ We know something similar about the earth-burial of the Valerii in the neighbourhood of the Velia: Cic., *de leg.* 2, 58; Plutarch, *Popl.* 23 end; cp. G. B. Niebuhr, *Röm. Gesch.* 1³, 442.

⁵ For details, see L. Leifer, *Klio, Beihaft.* 14, 10 n.

⁶ On the dating, see J. Stroux, *Philol.* 1931, 460 f.; G. Pasquali, *Preistoria della poesia Romana* 60.

⁷ F. Studniczka, *Österr. Jahresh.* 6, 128 f.; 7, 241 f.

⁸ F. Studniczka, op. cit. 6, 133 f., 155.

⁹ L. Savignoni, *Nsc.* 1900, 143 f.; cp. 1899, 158, figs. 7-18; Chr. Hülsen, *Röm. Mitt.* 17, 25 n. 2; Viedebantt, *RE. Suppl.* 4, 491. The fact that there is a sacrificial trench seems to me to rule out the possibility of material added later to fill in.

¹⁰ U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 2, 4 n. 2.

¹¹ *Planta* no. 200; *Conway* no. 175.

¹² Author, *TM.* 148 f.; see also E. Tabeling, *Mater Larum* 91; E. Schwyzler, *Rhein. Mus.* 1931, 217; 1935, 113 n. 3; A. v. Blumenthal, *D. Igwin. Taf.* 71 n. 1; E. Norden, *Altgermanien* 158 n. 1.

¹³ On the burial of the gens *Cornelia*, cp. Cic., *de leg.* 2, 56 f. A collection of the older literature on the graves of the Scipios' on the Via Appia is given in Platner-Ashby, *A topographical dictionary of ancient Rome* 484 f.; see also *Arch. Anz.* 1927, 168 f.; 1928, 98, fig. 13; Author, *Epochen* I, 112 n. 49.

¹⁴ Cp. on this question E. Norden, *Altgermanien* 109 n. 2.

¹⁵ G. Säfslund, *Le mura di Roma republ. (Skrifter utgijona av Svenska Inst. i Rom 1932)*, 163 f.; Platner-Ashby, op. cit. 350 f.; cp. A. Boëthius, *Gnomon* 8, 234 f.; F. G. Scott, op. cit. 81 f.; F. Matz, *Gnomon* 3, 459.

¹⁶ Cp. now on this question J. Hasebroek, *Griech. Wirtschafts- und Gesellschaftsgesch.* 41 f.

¹⁷ *Riv. di filol.* 54, 10.

¹⁸ Author, *GG.* 172 ff. Protest has been raised in many quarters against this view: P. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 20, 201 f.; H. Krahe, *Paul und Braunes Beitr.* 58, 284 f.; V. Pisani, *Giornale di letteratura e politica* 1935, 102. Yet it seems to be finding confirmation. On an Etrusco-Raetian bronze ewer of Caslŷr appears *velxanu*, *PID* 215,

which can only be understood as a dedication to the god; cp. E. Vetter, *Glotta* 28, 205 f.

¹⁹ F. v. Duhn, op. cit. 1, 357 f., 361, 408, 504; G. Pasquali, op. cit. 61 n. 2.

²⁰ W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 474 n. 4.

²¹ W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 467, 478 f.; cp. E. Norden, op. cit. 110 n. 1.

²² It has been stated that the sacrifice made to the Palatine was called *Palatuar* and that it was only from this that the *Diva Palatua* and the *flamen Palatualis* were 'developed', but the reverse is the truth. Further, *Palatuar* (from **Palatuale*) and *Palatualis* are morphologically identical.

²³ A. Nehring, *Indog. Jahrb.* 18, 405 f.

²⁴ On the name of Pales, see now K. Vahlert, *Praeaeismus und römische Religion* (Frankf. Diss. 1935), 77 f.

²⁵ Solin. 1, 15 and G. Wissowa, *Roschers Myth. Lex.* 3, 1278; K. Vahlert, op. cit.

²⁶ L. Deubner, *Röm. Mitt.* 36/37, 30 f.

²⁷ Walde-Hofmann, *Lat. etymol. Wörterb.*³ 133; K. Vahlert, op. cit. 57 n. 12.

²⁸ K. Vahlert, op. cit. 56 f., where the case is presented as a whole.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

²⁹ CIL. I, 1³, 203 f.; for later finds, see O. Leuze, *Bursians Jahresber.* 228, 97 f.; G. Wissowa, *Hermes* 58, 369 f.

³⁰ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 2 f.

³¹ Further material, particularly on the sign NP, in G. Wissowa's *RuKdR*² 438 f.; see also O. Leuze, op. cit. 117 f.

³² On a stratum originating at the end of the kingly period, see M. P. Nilsson, *Zur Frage und dem Alter des vorcaesar. Kalenders* (*Strena philologica Upsalensis* 1922) and K. Latte, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 24, 248.

³³ G. Mancini, *Nsc.* 1921, 73 f.; cp. G. Wissowa, *Hermes* 58, 378 f.; O. Leuze, op. cit. 111 f.

³⁴ W. F. Otto, *Wiener Stud.* 35, 62 f.; E. Tabeing, *Mater Larum* 39 f.

³⁵ The reading IND is confirmed by the *fasti* of Ostia: G. Calza, *Nsc.* 1921, 255 (in spite of G. Wissowa, op. cit. 371); CIL. 14 Suppl. 4547, 11; C. Koch, *Gestirnverehrung im alten Italien* 71 f.

³⁶ Author, *GG.* 188 f.; cp. M. P. Nilsson, *Die Lit. Ztg.* 51, 2226 f. I cannot at present believe in the possibility of a ritual earlier than the gods without conclusive proof.

³⁷ *RuKdR*² 19; cp. *Gesamm. Abhandl.* 175 f.

³⁸ Author, *TM.* 94 f.

³⁹ W. F. Otto, *Philol. N. F.* 18, 168, 205 f.

⁴⁰ In defence of this view, see *RuKdR*² 317; cp., on the other hand, the trenchant arguments of C. Koch, op. cit. 63 f.

⁴¹ In the narrow room at our disposal a full discussion of the problem was impossible. It is the less necessary to-day, inasmuch as the clear and acute interpretation of C. Koch (op. cit. 81 f.) is now at our disposal.

⁴¹ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 88.

⁴² *Planta* no. 243; *Conway* no. 261; H. Jacobsohn, *Altital. Inschriftl.* 73.

⁴³ See now H. J. Rose, *Harvard Theol. Rev.* 30, 165 f.

⁴⁴ C. Koch, op. cit. 90 n. 1, compares the invocation in the will of Ptolemy Evergetes II from Cyrene. We may also adduce the oath of Eupolemus in the inscription of Theangela in Caria, published by M. Rostovtzeff (*Revue des études anc.* 33, 6 f.): *ὁμνῶν Δία Ἰῆν Ἥλιον*. For further cases in point, see M. Rostovtzeff, op. cit. 19 f. and H. J. Rose, op. cit. 168 f.

⁴⁵ I refer to conditions at Ialysos in Rhodes (H. Hiller v. Gärtringen, *Ath. Mitt.* 41, 181 f.) and to the well-known problem, presented by the history of Naples: H. Nissen, *Ital. Landesk.* 2, 748; E. Pais, *Storia di Roma* 1, 2, 470 f.; K. J. Beloch, *Röm. Gesch.* 398 n.

⁴⁶ *Indog. Forsch.* 23, 351.

⁴⁷ *Thes. ling. lat.* 1, 1402, 56 f.; O. Koch, op. cit. 97.

⁴⁸ *Thes. ling. lat.* 2, 47.

⁴⁹ If we remember that Angitia was certainly a Marsian goddess and that Anagnia, named after her (W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 479 n. 2) ranked as a Marsian settlement (Schol. *Veron. Verg. Aen.* 7, 684), perhaps *Auxanum* and the *Marsi Anxates* and *Anxatini* (H. Krahe, *Zeitschr. f. Ortsnamenforsch.* 8, 155 f.; on the -s suffix, see also *TM.* 101) may also be drawn into the question.

⁵⁰ *Rhein. Mus.* 1935, 116.

⁵¹ Author, *GG.* 62 f.

⁵² C. Koch, op. cit. 66, 72 f., 90 f.; against H. J. Rose, op. cit. 175 f.

⁵³ G. Herbig, *Philol.* 74, 446 f.

⁵⁴ Author, *GG.* 8; but see also the guesses of F. Heurgon, *Rev. des études lat.* 14, 109 f.

⁵⁵ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 241 n. 6.

⁵⁶ W. F. Otto, *Roschers Mythol. Lex.* 4, 823; on the *Dea Tacita*, cp. E. Tabeling, op. cit. 68 f.

⁵⁷ Cp. the recent essay of E. Fiesel, *Language* 11, 122 f., who had not seen my treatment of the question.

⁵⁸ *Nsc.* 1937, 241.

⁵⁹ A. Lindemann, *Die Sondergötter in der Apologetik der Civitas Dei Augustini* (Diss. Munich 1930), 57, and M. P. Nilsson, *Die Lit. Ztg.* 1930, 2225. Whether a god is called after a family or a family has a 'theophoric' name can only be decided by the facts of linguistic use. These show that *Volcanus*, *Mercurius* and others were gentile gods, whereas *Trebius* and *Thormena*, on the other hand, were named after *Trebo*s and *Hermes*, Etruscan *turms* (Author, *GG.* 41 f.).

⁶⁰ On *CIL* 6, 10200, cp. Chr. Hülsen, *Röm. Mitt.* 10, 298 f.

⁶¹ Chr. Hülsen, *Röm. Mitt.* 22, 229.

⁶² *Griech. Tragöd.* 2, 218.

⁶³ U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 218 n. 2.

⁶⁴ L. Malten, *Arch. Jahrb.* 1914, 184; for Demeter Erinyes, cp. also U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 210, 898 f.

⁶⁵ W. F. Otto, *Arch. f. lat. Lexikogr.* 15, 116; E. Tabeling, op. cit. 14 f., 101 f.

⁶⁶ Author, *GG.* 7 f.

⁶⁶ F. De Ruyt, *Charun, démon étrusque* 147 f., 189 f.

⁶⁷ Author, *GG.* 172 f.; a criticism of my suggestion is made by H. J. Rose, *Journ. Rom. stud.* 1933, 46 f.

⁶⁸ Author, *GG.* 194 f.; *TM.* 42 f.; L. Euing, *D. Sage von Tanaquil* (*Frankf. Stud.* 2), 28.

⁶⁹ Author, *TM.* 149; see also E. Schwyzer, *Rhein. Mus.* 35, 115 f.; 117 n. 2.

⁷⁰ Author, *TM.* 91 f.; cp. E. Norden, *Altgermanien* 273 f.; W. Schulze, *Kl. Schrift.* 214; for Demeter *Κουροτρόφος* cp. H. Usener, *Götternamen* 124 f.; *Nutrix* beside *Tellus* 129. For Illyrian *ana* cp. H. Krahe, *Indog. Forsch.* 46, 183 f.

⁷¹ Author, *TM.* 108 f.

⁷² Probus, *ad Georg.* 2, 385; cp. Author, *TM.* 90, 110. In answer to St. Weinstock's objections (*Glotta* 22, 143 n.; *RE.* 5 A1, 793) we may remark: (1) in the passage of Probus the mention of the *feriae sementivae* corresponds to the *ritus oscillorum iactationis frequens in Italia*, just as *ex hac causa ab Atheniensibus institutus* has its parallel in *ab Atticus est traditus*; (2) *feriae sementivae* as *Romana interpretatio* of *Alōpa* has no sense, since in the Latin you shovel, but do not sow; the identification of Floralia with *Ἀνθεστήρια* (Justin. 43, 4, 6), on the other hand, is full of meaning, as in both cases we have to do with blossoming.

⁷³ See above, pp. 9 f, 97.

⁷⁴ For Oscan *patanaī Pilstiaī* cp. author, *TM.* 113 f.; a different explanation (without any refutation of mine) is attempted by E. Schwyzer, op. cit. 111 f. (cp. n. 2). We must remember that *pinsere* and *pistor* in the realm of Roman religion lead to conceptions of a quite different character: K. Vahlert, *Praedeismus und röm. Religion* (*Diss. Frankfurt M.* 1935), 44 f.

⁷⁵ L. Malten, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 12, 294 f.; U. v. Wilamowitz, *Griech. Tragöd.* 2, 223. On Malten's emendation of the Homeric Hymn to Ceres 17 cp. W. F. Otto, *Dionysos* 59.

⁷⁶ Author, *TM.* 127 f.; E. Tabeling, op. cit. 37 f. On *Ἀγάρτου* Hesych.: H. Krahe, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 30, 393 f.; to Ceres in the serpent-car (F. Messerschmidt, *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* 5, 31; F. Weege, *Etrusk. Malerei* pl. 78) corresponds the similar representation of Demeter: W. A. Oldfather, *Philol.* 69, 117; Q. Quagliati, *Ausonia* 3, 191 f., fig. 43.

⁷⁷ Author, *Epochen* II, 254.

⁷⁸ Author, *TM.* 119 f.; against my views: St. Weinstock, *Glotta* 22, 140 f.; *RE.* 5 A1, 791 f.

⁷⁹ Liv. 8, 9, 8; cp. 10, 28, 13; 29, 4. The curse-formula is primitive: 'the archaic Triad Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus stands in the centre, of the Capitoline Triad there is no trace . . . every word of the document might be imagined as uttered in the sixth century'. (C. Koch, op. cit. 86.) With this goes the last hope of proving this death-side of Tellus to be secondary (St. Weinstock, *RE.* 5 A1, 802) and, with it, all views based upon it. Nor does the proof that the *porca praecidaneae* was a preliminary sacrifice (H. Weinstock, op. cit. 796) involve any objection to the death-side of Tellus—the less as the same holds good for Ceres with the *porca praesentanea* (Author, *TM.* 116 f.), even in the earliest times.

⁸⁰ *Arch. Jahrb.* 29, 179 f., 181 f.

⁸¹ Author, *TM.* 117 f.; on the representation of the horse of the dead in Rome: B. Schröder, *Bonner Jahrb.* 108/9, 42 f.; H. Holwerda, *Arch. Anz.* 1933, 71. To St. Weinstock's comments (*RE.* 5 A1, 794 f., and *Glotta* 22, 144 n. 2), I make the following reply:

(1) The existence of ox and stallion side by side in the cult of Ceres is as little remarkable as the bull-god, Mars, and the sacrifice of a horse to the same god on October 15th; (2) that spirits of 'group-feeling', rites earlier than the gods, and the like are, since K. Vahlert's fine studies, less probable than ever; (3) that the reason why we do not assume dependence if a Roman rite agrees with a Chinese or an African, but may well assume it if it agrees with a Greek, is this—that in the former case no historical link can be discovered, while in the latter the influence of Greece on Italy from the eighth century onwards will be denied by nobody.

⁸² Author, *TM.* 129 f.; E. Tabeling, *op. cit.* 55 f.

⁸³ Author, *TM.* 139 f.; on *βαλλήτωρ* and *λυθοβολία*: U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 293; on rites of disguise: St. Weinstock, *RE.* 14, 2308 f.; U. v. Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* 1, 293 n. 3; 295 n. 2.

⁸⁴ Cp. Author, *TM.* 144 f. Our latest evidence is the Demeter hymn of Philikos: M. Norsa, *Stud. ital. di filol. class.* N.S. 5, 87 f.; C. Gallavotti, *op. cit.* 9, 37 f.; A. Körte, *Hermes* 66, 442 f. I have treated the general questions connected with the raiillery in the cult of Demeter in *Epochen* 2, 245 f., where I have also considered whether traces of similar performances can also be proved for the cult of Ceres.

⁸⁵ St. Weinstock, *RE.* 5 A1, 792, 803 f.; *Glotta* 22, 161 f.; L. Deubner, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 33, 109.

⁸⁶ H. Jacobsohn, *Χάριτες* Leo 407 f.; St. Weinstock's attempts at etymology hardly represent an advance (*Glotta* 22, 153 f.; *RE.* 5 A1, 799 f.).

⁸⁷ E. Schwyzer, *op. cit.* 117 n. 2.

⁸⁸ W. F. Otto, *Dionysos* 26 f.; U. v. Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* 1, 9; 17.

⁸⁹ Evidence in favour of this view is given by K. Kerényi in his paper: *Satire und satura* (*Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* 9, 129 f.).

⁹⁰ P. Marconi, *Atti e memorie della società Magna Grecia* 1931; *Agrigento* 7 f., 20 f.; cp. *Arch. Anz.* 1933, 649 f.

⁹¹ This is in answer to U. v. Wilamowitz's conception of Demeter as an originally barbarian goddess: *op. cit.* 1, 88 n. 1; 2, 386 n. 2.

⁹² Author, *TM.* 17 f.; cp. above, p. 483 n. 184.

⁹³ *Athen. Mitt.* 53, 66 f. The Dionysos who is suspended on a column and Dionysos *δενδρότης* are distinguished by W. F. Otto, *Dionysos* 82. The latter appears on earthenware reliefs from Locri, W. A. Oldfather, *Philol.* 69, 115; cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* 1, 125 n. 1.

⁹⁴ Author, *TM.* 65 f.; E. Tabeling, *op. cit.* 214 n. 1, 24 n. 1. P. Romanelli, *Nsc.* 1929, 251 f., dealing with a mask of this bronze-leaf found at Bolsena, asks whether it can be an *oscillum*, and calls to mind the little masks of satyrs that have been found in Satricum (A. della Seta, *Museo di Villa Giulia* 1, 318, no. 11479 f.).

⁹⁵ Author, *TM.* 65 f.; E. Tabeling, *op. cit.* 21 n. 1, 24 n. 1. On swinging in the cult, cp. now the terracotta from Knossos:

A. Evans, *The Palace of Minos at Knossos* 4, 1, 24 f., fig. 13. We should also quote the fine paper of S. Ferri in *Historia* 3, 60 f.

⁹⁶ M. Halberstadt, *Mater Matula* (*Frankf. Stud.* 8).

⁹⁷ M. Halberstadt, op. cit. 17 f., 20 f., 42, 57 f.

⁹⁸ H. Krahe, *Zeitschr. f. Ortsnamenforschung* 6, 25; *vicus Falacrinus* in the Sabina: H. Nissen, *Italische Landeskde* 2, 468.

⁹⁹ A. Nehring, *Indog. Jahrb.* 13, 405.

¹⁰⁰ E. Benveniste, *Bull. soc. ling.* 1931, 68 f.; E. Fiesel, *Studi Etruschi* 7, 295 f.

¹⁰¹ W. Schulze, *ZGLN.* 489.

¹⁰² W. F. Otto, *D. Götter Griechenlands* 198; cp. *Dionysos* 105 f., 112 f., 126 f.

¹⁰³ W. F. Otto, *D. Götter Griechenlands* 191 f.

¹⁰⁴ An earlier date, however, for the cult of Dionysos as well is adopted by both W. F. Otto (*Dionysos* 52) and L. Deubner (*Neue Jahrb.* 1930, 621 f.).

¹⁰⁵ On the supposed Sabine word *ausel, cp. C. Koch, op. cit. 34 f.

¹⁰⁶ *Vortr. d. Biblioth. Warburg* 1925/26, 158 f.

¹⁰⁷ *Abhandl. z. röm. Relig.* 171 f.

¹⁰⁸ L. Malten, *Arch. Jahrb.* 29, 185 f.; author, *GG.* 23 f.

¹⁰⁹ Jordan-Hülsem, *Topogr. d. Stadt Rom.* 1, 8, 488; Platner-Ashby, op. cit. 328 f.

¹¹⁰ W. F. Otto, *RE.* 6, 2068 f.

¹¹¹ Author, *GG.* 189 f.

¹¹² W. F. Otto, *Arch. f. latein. Lexikogr.* 15, 116; *Wiener Stud.* 35, 62 f.; E. Tüchler, op. cit. 14 f., 79, 101 f.

¹¹³ C. Koch, op. cit. 73 f.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

¹ *RuKdR*³ 112.

² Mention must be made at this point of the views of L. Deubner. Going beyond the suggestions already made by Wissowa, Deubner tries to get back into a time when man did not think himself required to call on the help of gods and daemons for specific desires and fears, but felt himself able to interfere in the course of nature, to avert disaster and to secure blessing. To this end he employed certain practices, in the efficacy of which he confidently believed. Like other peoples, the ancestors of the Romans will have passed through an age, which we may define as pre-deistic, the rites of which bore a magic, 'enchanting' character.

Deubner has given expression to this thought on various occasions, in special dissertations (*Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 8 Beih. 66 f.; 13, 481 f.; *Neue Jahrb.* 27-8, 321 f.; *Glotta* 3, 34 f.; *Röm. Mitt.* 1921-2, 14 f.) and in general narratives (*Chantepié de la Saussaye, Lehrs. d. Religionsgesch.* 24, 420 f.; *Antike* 2, 61 f.; *Magie und Religion*, Freiburg, 1922). We cannot go as fully into his views as we could wish to do. Above all, we cannot here investigate such general questions and presumptions as, for example, what magic in its essence means, or, how far a magic epoch is to be regarded as a necessary stage of transition in every religion, and others like them. This

would lead us beyond the limits of our discussion. We have to do, not with a stage lying before the Roman religion that we know, but with Roman religion itself—not with its pre-history, but with its history. We may, however, refer the student who wishes to pursue these questions critically to the acute and penetrating arguments of K. Vahlert, *Praedeismus und röm. Religion* (Frank. Diss., 1935), with which the present author completely identifies himself. Deubner's theories are particularly discussed there, pp. 15 f., 35 f., 62 f.

³ On a similar case in Iguvium, see A. v. Blumenthal, *Die Iguvinischen Tafeln* 36 f.

⁴ W. F. Otto, *RE.* 6, 2063 f.

⁵ See below, p. 144.

⁶ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 559 f.

⁷ W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 579 f.; G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 242 f.; G. Herbig, *Berl. Philol. Woch.* 1916, 1440 f.; 1472.

⁸ W. F. Otto, *op. cit.* 2054 f.

⁹ Cp. G. Herbig, *Glotta* 5, 232 n. 1.

¹⁰ H. Jacobssohn, *Quaest. Plant.* 19 n. 1; M. Leumann in Stolz-Schmalz, *Lat. Gramm.*,⁶ 115.

¹¹ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 142 n. 5; cp. *Nsc.* 1930, 400 f. (Aeculanum) and E. Vetter, *Glotta* 28, 187.

¹² E. Herrman (*Sprachwiss. Komment. zu Homer* 47) considers *Māvors* as a Latin change from the reduplicated Oscan *Māmers*. Quite apart from the fact that this kind of change is unintelligible and that, as we shall soon see, *Māmers* cannot be explained from Oscan, the appearance of *Mārs* in the Sabellian dialects and in Umbrian remains unexplained.

¹³ *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Sprachwiss.* 32, 195 n. 1; *Festschr. Wackernagel* 248 = *Kl. Schrift.* 310 f., 90.

¹⁴ On the existence, side by side, of the postulated form **Mārtis-mārts* and the long vowel in the stem of *Mārs*, *Mārtis*, *Mārcūs*, cp. Author, *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* 8, 155 f.

¹⁵ R. v. Planta, *Gramm. d. osk.-umbr. Dial.* 1, 239 f.

¹⁶ These views have recently found confirmation through the archaic *stips votiva* of Veii and its list of names. For all details cp. Author, *op. cit.* 154 f.

¹⁷ P. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 20, 202 n. 1.

¹⁸ G. Wissowa, *Roschers Mythol. Lexik.* 6, 241.

¹⁹ G. Mancini, *Nsc.* 1930, 353 f.; cp. F. Leifer, *Zum Problem der Foruminschrift* 16 n. 1.

²⁰ *Glotta* 10, 154 f.; and also in opposition to my view as given above, 20, 201, and A. v. Blumenthal, *Zeitschr. f. Ortsnamenforsch.* 8, 160.

²¹ W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 254 f.

²² Author, *TM.* 155 f.; P. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 12, 123 n. 1; E. Schwyzer, *Rhein. Mus.* 1935, 112 f.—On Venetic *Vescēs*, cp. E. Vetter, *Glotta* 23, 198, 199; also the fact that the Aurunci have a parallel in the Liburnian *Adoamalsl*: P. Kretschmer, *op. cit.* 123 f.; E. Vetter, *op. cit.* 198.

²³ *Op. cit.* 154.

²⁴ K. Koch, *op. cit.* 116 f.

²⁵ P. Kretschmer, *op. cit.* 154.

²⁶ W. F. Otto, *Die Götter Griechenlands* 128.

²⁷ A completely different interpretation of the word is now offered by A. v. Blumenthal, *Die Iguvinischen Tafeln* 56.

²⁸ P. Kretschmer, *Einlfg. i. d. Gesch. d. griech. Sprache* 80; *Glotta* 18, 118

²⁹ H. Krahe, *Indog. Forsch.* 49, 267.

³⁰ P. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 14, 308 f.

³¹ See above, p. 18 f.

³² Cp. G. Devoto, *Gli anticht Italici* 52.

³³ W. F. Otto, *Rhein. Mus.* 64, 449 f.; cp. F. Münzer, *RE.* 6, 1768, no. 68.

³⁴ The gens *Rutina* has now become real to us at Chiusi: *Nac.* 1928, 55 f.

³⁵ Author, *GG.* 77 f. We can leave out of the question the undated cult of the goddess Feronia in Rome, as it was probably adopted, not immediately from the private cult of a gens, but from the chief shrine of the goddess on Mount Soracte, where she already bore this name.

³⁶ F. Münzer, *Röm. Adelspart.* 52.

³⁷ Similar conclusions have already been drawn by Ed. Meyer (*Gesch. d. Altert.* 2, 516 f.) and P. Kretschmer (*Gercke-Norden, Einlfg. i. d. Altertumswiss.* I,² 6, 111 f.) from different facts. On the meaning of the clan in general in Rome, cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 37 f.

³⁸ *Gesamm. Aufs. z. Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgesch.* 193.

³⁹ F. Münzer, op. cit. 69 n. 1.

⁴⁰ F. Münzer, op. cit. 65 f.

⁴¹ See above p. 68.

⁴² See above, pp. 24, 28.

⁴³ F. Münzer, op. cit. 52 f.; K. Latte, *Zwei Exkurse z. röm. Staatsrecht* (*Nachr. Gött. Ges. Wiss. N.F.* 1, 3), 66 f.

⁴⁴ Author, *GG.* 80.

⁴⁵ Th. Vetter, *Glotta* 13, 145 f.; otherwise F. Leifer, *Stud. z. ant. Ämterwesen* 1, 291; *Zum Problem d. Foruminschrift* 38 n. 1.

⁴⁶ Op. cit. 99.

⁴⁷ V. Dumitrescu, *L'età del ferro nel Piceno* 47 f.

⁴⁸ Gisela A. M. Richter, *Metrop. Mus. Cat. of Bronzes* no. 40; *Handbook, Class. Coll.* 61, fig. 34; *Rev. Arch.* 1904, 1, pl. VII.

⁴⁹ F. v. Duhn, *Altital. Gräberkde* 1, 473.

⁵⁰ I confine myself to a short summary. Justification, so far as it is not specially given, will be found for Liber in *TM.* 17 f., 65 f.; for Ceres in *TM.* 129 f.; for Volcanus, *GG.* 196 f.

⁵¹ R. S. Conway, *Studi Etruschi* 4, 288 f.; *The Prae-Italic dialects* 1, no. 162 and p. 163 f.; E. Vetter, *Glotta* 23, 201 f. Cp. also U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 2, 334 n. 2; Author, *TM.* 26 f.; *Epochen* 1, 50 n. 80.

⁵² Author, *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* 8, 158 f.

⁵³ On Flora cp. above, p. 137.

⁵⁴ H. Mühlstein, *Die Kunst d. Etrusker* 1, pl. CCXXII f.

⁵⁵ *Journ. Rom. stud.* 1935, 139 f., 146 f.

⁵⁶ Author, *GG.* 168 f.; cp. G. Q. Giglioli, *L'arte etrusca* pl. XLVII, 6 (7-6th cent.), and V. Müller, *Arch. Anz.* 1931, 344 f., fig. 8.

⁵⁷ *Festschrift P. Arndt* 36 f.

⁵⁸ On what follows, see Author, *GG.* 201 f.; *TM.* 29. Cp. also L. Banti, *Studi Etruschi* 5, 196.

⁵⁹ S. P. Cortsen, *Glotta* 28, 168. On the name of *turms* cp. Author, *GG.* 201 f. The Bacchiadae of Corinth, whose descendant, Demaratos, took up his residence in Tarquinii (cp. p. 43) were named after Bakchos; U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 2, 72 n. 3. May Demaratos perhaps have brought the name of the god with him?

⁶⁰ W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 589, add. 216; G. Devoto, *Studi Etruschi* 6, 248 f.; S. P. Cortsen, op. cit. 177; U. v. Wilamowitz, *Hesiodos Erga* on vv. 589.

⁶¹ F. Schachermayr, *Etrusk. Frühgesch.* 122 f.

⁶² Cp. F. Matz, *Gnomon* 6, 642.

⁶³ M. Hammarström, *Studi Etruschi* 5, 373, 375 f.

⁶⁴ U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 320 n. 1.

⁶⁵ W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 47; P. Kretschmer, *Einlfg. i. d. Gesch. d. griech. Sprache* 246; E. Norden, *Altgermanien* 262 f.

⁶⁶ P. Kretschmer, *Festschrift Bezzenberger* 89 f.

⁶⁷ On the Illyrian element as intermediary in the carrying over of loan-words from Greek, compare now H. Krahe, *Indog. Forsch.* 54, 117 f.

⁶⁸ L. Malten, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 29, 33 f.

⁶⁹ Author, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 29, 22 f.

⁷⁰ P. Kretschmer, *Einlfg. i. d. Gesch. d. griech. Sprache* 280 f.; A. v. Blumenthal, *Hesychastud.* 42 f.

⁷¹ On what follows, cp. W. Jaeger, *Antike und Humanismus* 21 f.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

¹ See above, p. 14 f.

² On what follows cp. Author, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 27, 43 f.; *TM.* 48 f.

³ Aristoph. *Lysistr.* p. 19.

⁴ U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 200 f.

⁵ *Riv. di filol.* 54, 11.

⁶ *Glotta* 19, 46 f. My attempt to prove the existence of *senarii* before the period of literature has recently been questioned by G. Pasquali, *La preistoria della poesia Romana* 49 f. But in the case of the verse quoted by Gellius, at least, I would hold to my view. The author expressly states that the *senarius* itself stood in the *Annales maximi* (4, 5, 6). The evidence is valuable enough, and it is up to us to learn from it about the character and content of the work. We must not take the other course and impute value or lack of value to this unimpeachable witness on the ground of general considerations.

⁷ E. Tabelaing, *Mater Larum* 25 f.; Author, *TM.* 63.

⁸ *KL. Schrift.* 4, 469 f.

⁹ Author, *TM.* 18, 20 f.

¹⁰ Author, *TM.* 65 f.

¹¹ *Monum. dell' Inst.* 8, pl. II; cp. F. Messerschmidt, *Beitr. z. Chronol. d. etrusk. Wandmalerei* 41; S. Ferri, *Historia* 3, 68 f.

¹² F. Leo, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* 1, 77 n. 1.

¹³ See above, p. 122.

¹⁴ Author, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 29, 29; *Epochen* 1, 51 n. 87.

¹⁶ Author, *TM*. 121.

¹⁶ Author, *Epochen* II, 245 f., where demonstration in detail is attempted.

¹⁷ *Preistoria della poesia Romana* (1936); but cp. also E. Kapp, *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1936, 477 f.

¹⁸ G. Pasquali, op. cit. 59 f.

¹⁸ G. Pasquali, op. cit. 29 f.

²⁰ O. A. Danielsson, *Glotta* 16, 88 n. 2; S. P. Cortsen, *Glotta* 28, 156.

²¹ Cp. Th. Mommsen, *Röm. Chronologie*³ 220 n. 1; W. F. Otto, *Philol. N.F.* 18, 166.

²² W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 470.

²³ P. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 1, 28.

²⁴ K. Meister, *Griech.-latein. Eigennam.* 1, 129 f.

²⁵ For literature on what follows, see pp. 117 f., 495 n. 12.

²⁶ *Rhein. Mus.* 44, 325 — *Kl. Schrift.* 3, 166 f.

²⁷ W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 475 n. 3.

²⁸ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 130 n. 3.

²⁹ The attempt to tamper with the fact that we really have a calendar date here, for the sake of the difficult *pūmperiais* (R. Planta, *Grammat. d. osk.-umbr. Dial.* 2, 632) is doomed in advance to failure. It is much more natural, on the contrary, to suppose from the fact that *fiſtiais pūmperiais* and *fiſtiais eiduis* occur in the same context in the Capuan inscriptions, that in the first case, too, we have to do with a date, perhaps that of an old festival. Bücheler had already thought of the *nonae quintanae* and brought the word into connexion with Oscan **pompe*, 'quinque'. It can be no accident that the only recorded day of the *Dius Fidius*, the foundation-day of his temple *in colle*, falls on the fifth of June, that is to say, on one of the *nonae quintanae*. It seems to provide confirmation of Bücheler's idea. Cp. G. Devoto, *Gli antichi Italici* 261, 280; *Gnomon* 8, 417; *Atti dell' Istit. Veneto* 89, 297 f.; E. Vetter, *Glotta* 23, 192; E. Norden, *Altgermanien* 165, 182 n. 2.

³⁰ U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 225 n. 2.

³¹ P. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 13, 112 f.

³² Author, *TM*. 129 f.; E. Tübeling, op. cit. 84 n. 7, 102.

³³ P. Kretschmer, op. cit. 111 f.; Author, *GG.* 95 f.; on *Pandia*, cp. H. Usener, *Götternamen*² 61 f.; U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 1, 258 n. 2.

³⁴ Author, *GG.* 96 f.

³⁵ Author, *TM*. 130.

³⁶ G. Devoto, *Gli antichi Italici* 231.

³⁷ G. Devoto, op. cit. 183, 231.

³⁸ G. Devoto, op. cit. 241.

³⁹ G. Devoto, op. cit. 240 f.

⁴⁰ U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 1, 26 f.

⁴¹ K. Latte, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 24, 247.

⁴² *Die Iguvinischen Tafeln* 60.

⁴³ J. Meringer, *Indog. Forsch.* 21, 296 f.

⁴⁴ F. Sommer, *Indog. Forsch.* 42, 117 f.

⁴⁵ J. Meringer, *Indog. Forsch.* 18, 215 f.; E. Walde, *Etym. lat. Wörterbuch*² s.v. *trabs*; P. Kretschmer, *Einl. i. d. Gesch. d. griech. Sprache* 118; *KZ.* 81, 898.

⁴⁶ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 104.

- ⁴⁸ Author, *GG.* 47 f.
⁴⁹ See above, p. 160 f.
⁵⁰ Author, *GG.* 66 f.
⁵¹ W. F. Otto, *Die Götter Griechenlands* 33.
⁵² Author, *TM.* 122 f.
⁵³ Mielenitz, *RE.* 5 A, 408 f.; but cp. also St. Weinstock, *RE.* 5 A, 802 f.
⁵⁴ S. P. Cortsen, *Glotta* 18, 184 f.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

- ¹ On its original meaning see G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 512; G. Rohde, *Die Kultsatzungen d. röm. Pontifices* 81.
² Cp. Th. Mommsen, *Staatsr.* 2³, 39 f.; G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 512.
³ U. v. Wilamowitz, *Hellenist. Dichtg.* 2, 289; Author, *TM.* 131.
⁴ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 435, 439; Th. Mommsen, *CIL.* I, 1², p. 289.
⁵ *Staatsr.* 2³, 4, 12 (cp. O. Hirschfeld, *Hermes* 8, 470); another view in *Röm. Chronologie*² 241 f.
⁶ *Thes. l. l.* 3, 1803 f.
⁷ *Thes. l. l.* 3, 1800, 23 f.
⁸ *Op. cit.* 469.
⁹ *RuKdR*² 517 n. 5, 557 n. 3.
¹⁰ *RuKdR*² 436 n. 5, 439.
¹¹ Author, *GG.* 188 f., 193.
¹² G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 557 n. 3.
¹³ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 144, 556 f.
¹⁴ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 436 n. 5, 515 n. 11.
¹⁵ W. F. Otto, *Philol. N.F.* 18, 185 f.; G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 116 n. 1.
¹⁶ Varro, *de l. l.* 6, 18, *aliquot huius diei vestigia fugae in sacris apparent.* For this very reason G. Devoto's other explanation cannot be right (*Atti del R. Istituto Veneto* 90, 1930-1, 1080 f.); he himself calls attention to the difficulty (p. 1083).
¹⁷ The evidence in Th. Mommsen, *CIL.* I, 1², p. 289.
¹⁸ *RuKdR*² 136 f.; Rosch. *Myth. Lex.* 5, 379 f.
¹⁹ Th. Mommsen, *Röm. Chronol.*² 38 f.; G. Wissowa, *op. cit.* 384.
²⁰ Cp. Th. Mommsen, *op. cit.* 43.
²¹ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 430 f.; *Gesamm. Abb.* 202.
²² Author, *TM.* 6 f.
²³ The material in P. P. Schebesta, *Anthropos* 1926, 496 f.; L. Frobenius, *Erythraea* 40 f., 229.
²⁴ P. P. Schebesta, *op. cit.* 497.
²⁵ Müller-Deecke, *Die Etrusker*, 1, 432.
²⁶ L. Frobenius, *op. cit.* 325.
²⁷ Cp. L. Frobenius, *Monum. Afric.* 298 f.; *Erythraea* 40 f., 221 f., 324 f., where in both cases references are given to the older literature (George M. Theal, B. G. Frazer, H. Zimmern). Cp. *Kulturgesch. Afrikas* 274.
²⁸ Cp. L. Frobenius, *Erythraea* 327.
²⁹ Author, *GG.* 107, 116, 144 f.; A. E. Gordon, *Transact. and proceed. of the Americ. Philol. Assoc.* 63, 185 f.; *Univ. of Calif. Publ. in Class. Archaeol.* 2, 1, 18 f.

³⁰ Author, *GG.* 150 f.

³¹ Author, *GG.* 144 f.; E. Tabeling, *Mater Larum* 65 f.

³² Typical for the 'stranger' is the Slav story, to which L. Frobenius (*Monum. Afric.* 345 f.) refers.

³³ Suet. *Calig.* 95; cp. G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 248. Cp. also L. Morpurgo, *Nsc.* 1931, 298 f.; cp. 252, 280; A. E. Gordon, *Univ. of Calif. Publ. in Class. Archaeol.* 2, 1, 19 n. 92.

³⁴ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 116 n. 1; Th. Mommsen, *CIL.* I, 1², p. 320 f.

³⁵ P. Ducati, *Storia di Bologna*, 1, 135, fig. 75; cp. also 132, fig. 74, and Author, *Studi e materiali di storia della religione* 10, 135 f.

³⁶ W. F. Otto, *Vergil*, 16 f.

³⁷ Against L. Deubner's divergent explanation (*Hermes* 69, 316 f.), cp. now A. Alföldi, *Röm. Mitt.* 50, 28 n. 6. That the *Iovis Optimi Maximi ornatus* in Livy 10, 7, 10 means the dress of the god himself should never have been questioned. The view that accompanies it, that we have to do with the old dress of the king (cp. A. Alföldi, op. cit. 29 f.), derives its special interest from the fact. It might lead to conclusions that run parallel to those that we have here drawn. But that would require a separate study.

³⁸ K. Latte, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 24, 244 ff., 256 f.

³⁹ *RuKdR*² 24 f.

⁴⁰ Op. cit. 245.

⁴¹ On Panda Cela and Patulcius Clusius, see below; on Anna Perenna, cp. *TM.* 92 f.; E. Norden, *Altgermanien* 274 n. 1. I cannot see that the observations of E. Linkomies (*Gnomon* 12, 418 f.) have upset the derivation of the name from Etruscan.

⁴² Walde-Hofmann, *Lat. etymol. Wörterb.*³ 203.

⁴³ *Thes. ling. lat.* 3, 857 f.

⁴⁴ Th. Usener, *Götternamen*² 258; Stoll-Höfer in *Mythol. Lexik.* 2, 1633 f.; H. Mayer, *RE.* 11, 2233.

⁴⁵ H. Usener, op. cit. 259; Roscher in *Mythol. Lexik.* 1, 1406; Tessen, *RE.* 6, 1154.

⁴⁶ Op. cit. 255 f.

⁴⁷ K. Latte, op. cit. 245.

⁴⁸ G. Rohde, op. cit. 29 f.

⁴⁹ Op. cit. 252 f.

⁵⁰ K. Latte, op. cit. 254.

⁵¹ Op. cit. 253.

⁵² G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 26.

⁵³ W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 483.

⁵⁴ Author, *Epoche* I, 124 f.

⁵⁵ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 29; W. F. Otto, *RE. Suppl.* 3, 1178.

⁵⁶ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 104.

⁵⁷ K. Kerényi, *Studi e materiali di storia delle relig.* 9, 18 f.; cp. G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 22 n. 2.

⁵⁸ K. Latte, op. cit. 253.

⁵⁹ K. Latte, op. cit. 253.

⁶⁰ U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 204 n. 1.

⁶¹ J. Wackernagel in H. Lommel, *Stud. z. indog. Femininbildung* 67; G. Herbig, *Indog. Anz.* 37, 29 f.; Author, *GG.* 181; E. Tabeling, op. cit. 56; P. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 2, 79 n. 1.

⁶² Author, *GG.* 179 f.

- ⁶³ Op. cit. 255.
- ⁶⁴ J. Wackernagel, *Mélanges Saussure* 125 f.; cp. G. Rohde, op. cit. 62.
- ⁶⁵ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 208. On the relation of the two festivals, cp. C. Koch, op. cit. 78 f.
- ⁶⁶ K. Kerényi, op. cit. 22.
- ⁶⁷ E. Gerhard, *Etrusk. Spiegel*, pl. CCXL; E. Fiesel, *Namen des griech. Mythos* 25.
- ⁶⁸ K. Kerényi, op. cit. 24 f.; on Zeus Areios, cp. L. Deubner, *Kult und Spiel im alten Olympia* 20.
- ⁶⁹ Author, *Glotta* 20, 165 f.
- ⁷⁰ Author, *RE.* 15, 1795; K. Kerényi, op. cit. 24 f.
- ⁷¹ Op. cit. 249.
- ⁷² Author, *TM.* 150 f.
- ⁷³ G. Wissowa, *Gesamm. Abhandl.* 316 f.; *RuKdR*³ 25.
- ⁷⁴ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 25.
- ⁷⁵ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 25, 193.
- ⁷⁶ H. Henzen, *Acta frat. Arval.* 147 f.; G. Wissowa, *RE.* 2, 1482 f.; *Gesamm. Abhandl.* 310 f.
- ⁷⁷ Otherwise G. Rohde, op. cit. 88 f.
- ⁷⁸ F. B. Hofmann in Stolz-Schmalz, *Lat. Gramm.*⁵ 594.
- ⁷⁹ Some comments that well repay attention in G. Rohde, op. cit. 88.
- ⁸⁰ Wissowa, too, uses the evidence in this way.
- ⁸¹ Op. cit. 247.
- ⁸² U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 2, 306 f.; W. W. Tarn, *Hellenist. civil.*³ 305.
- ⁸³ U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 2, 307; *Hellenist. Dichtung* 1, 77; G. Costa, *Convivium* 1935, 597.
- ⁸⁴ Op. cit. 248. To say that among the Romans, in literature especially (Dionys. *Hal.* 1, 4, 2; cp. K. Latte, op. cit. 248 n. 1), Fortune never appeared as an all-inclusive cosmic power is mere unfounded assertion.
- ⁸⁵ W. F. Otto, *RE.* 7, 32.
- ⁸⁶ E. Fraenkel, *Plautin. im. Plautus* 107 f.
- ⁸⁷ K. Sauer, *Unters. z. Darst. des Todes* (Frankf. Diss. 1930); W. Schulze, *Kl. Schrift.* 138 f.; G. Rodenwald, *Arch. Anz.* 1923/24 366 f.
- ⁸⁸ G. Rohde, *D. Bedeutung d. Tempelgründ. im Staatsleben d. Römer* 13 f.
- ⁸⁹ G. Rohde, op. cit. 12.
- ⁹⁰ G. Rohde, op. cit. 15 f.
- ⁹¹ G. Rohde, op. cit. 8.
- ⁹² G. Rohde, op. cit. 3 f.
- ⁹³ W. F. Otto, *Rhein. Mus.* 64, 459; *Wiener Stud.* 34, 326; Author, *GG.* 62 f.
- ⁹⁴ K. Latte, op. cit. 244.
- ⁹⁵ K. Latte, op. cit. 256.
- ⁹⁶ The latest treatment is that by Pfister, *RE.* 'numen', from whom my examples are taken.
- ⁹⁷ Further quotations in A. Forbiger's commentary in *Aen.* 7, 297.
- ⁹⁸ That *numen*, in these and similar cases, should simply be synonymous with *deus*, as Pfister supposes, is, of course, impossible.
- ⁹⁹ F. Marx in fr. 277; C. Cichorius, *Unters. zu Lucilius* 288 f.

¹⁰⁰ N. Terzaghi, too, places it in the text of his edition of Lucilius (1934), vv. 941-942.

¹⁰¹ There are many examples of *nomen* replacing the less familiar *numen* in the manuscripts; in our case the comment would help to facilitate the change.

¹⁰² Op. cit. 247.

¹⁰³ W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 474; W. F. Otto, *RE. Suppl.* 3, 1176.

¹⁰⁴ M. Leumann in Stolz-Schmalz, *Lat. Gramm.*⁵ 215.

¹⁰⁵ W. F. Otto, op. cit. 1189.

¹⁰⁶ W. Schulze, op. cit. 474 n. 5.

¹⁰⁷ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 201; Th. Mommsen, *CIL.* I, 1¹, p. 326. The usual participle *conditus* is a new formation based on the compound. Originally we should have to expect **dhōto-* and a reduction of the vowel of the stem in composition, cp. ind. *dāti*, 'cuts off', parti, *dītā*, but *ava-tta-*, *pāri-tta-* (Joh. Schmidt, *K.Z.* 25, 54 f., 82, 379; *Pluralbild. d. indog. Neutra* 255 f.). That gives us **con-dito-s.* Cp., too, H. Osthoff, *Paul u. Braunes Beitr.* 13, 426 f., and Walde-Hofmann, *Lat. etymol. Wörterb.*⁵ 266.

¹⁰⁸ H. Osthoff, op. cit. 427.

¹⁰⁹ G. Devoto, *Gli antichi Italici* 227; K. Latte, op. cit. 257.

¹¹⁰ Th. Mommsen, *CIL.* I, 1², 326; G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 201 f.

¹¹¹ H. Usener, *Kl. Schrift.* 4, 117; G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 431 n. 3.

¹¹² H. Usener, op. cit. 117.

¹¹³ Cp. p. 175 f.; it is most remarkable in this context, that at these Consualia, too, the *rex sacrorum* comes in some way or other into action (*Fasti Praenest.* on December the 15th).

¹¹⁴ Something like this is true also of Panda Cela and Patuleius Clusivius (Clusius), as which Janus himself was invoked: K. Latte, op. cit. 345; G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 195 n. 2, 108; but cp. W. F. Otto, op. cit. 1177.

¹¹⁵ W. F. Otto, *Die Manen* 59.

¹¹⁶ M. Leumann, op. cit. 312, 329.

¹¹⁷ We have already referred to the heroes, *Μάρτων* and *Κεράων*. They are active participles and, as such, 'nomina agentis'. But they are not formed from the root, but from the stem of the present.

¹¹⁸ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 390; *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 22, 207 f.

¹¹⁹ F. v. Duhn, *Ital. Gräberkde* 1, 357 f., 361, 498, 504; Author, *GG.* 2 n. 2; G. Pasquali, *Preistoria della poesia Romana* 61 n. 2.

¹²⁰ F. Leo, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* 1, 44.

¹²¹ Author, *GG.* 1, 124 f.; *Welt als Gesch.* 2, 70 f.

¹²² G. Rohde, op. cit. 3 f.; W. F. Otto, *Vergil* 14 f.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

¹ *Wien. Stud.* 34, 318 f.; 35, 62 f.

² Cp. also *TM.* 97 f.

³ Cp. E. Tabelaing, *Mater Larum* 39 f.

⁴ Author, *TM.* 70 f., 88 n. 1.

⁵ Author, *TM.* 65 f.

⁶ The etiological legends, that are attached to the use of *oscillatio* and the Attic Aiora, that cannot be separated from it, show, despite their great variety in detail, a complete community in certain ideas;

I have developed this in *TM.* 77 f., especially 88 f. If any one objects that I have taken the notices of fact and history, contained in the ancient evidence, without discussion, he would be completely misunderstanding me. I was only concerned to demonstrate a unity of shape (that is to say, of precisely what belongs to ideas), not connexions in point of fact.

⁷ *Plautin. im Plautus* 59 f., 88 f.

⁸ E. Fraenkel, *op. cit.* 91.

⁹ I would here add a short note on Virbius, the companion of Diana at Aricia, of whom I have treated in *GG.* 122 f. He was none other than Hippolytus; the legend rightly makes him be translated to the Latin shrine. The name Virbius has its model in the Laconian Ἰρβος, the river *Virbius* in that country and the spring *Virvinus*, which point in part to connexions with Artemis and even with the legend of Hippolytus. If I have supposed in that name, as in the name of Hippolytus himself, a relation to the horse, it is of importance that a yearly sacrifice of a horse to Diana of Aricia is attested by Ambrose, *de virgin.* 3, 2, 5 f. It was associated with the death of the hero; cp. now H. Herter, *Gnomon* 6, 229, discussing M. Klein, *Meletem. Ambros., Königsb. Diss.* 1927. Artemis-Diana is elsewhere, too, connected with the horse (L. Curtius, *Rom. Mitt.* 45, 35; R. S. Conway, *The Praetatic dialects* 1, 91) as is her close relative Enodia (U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* I, 174 f.). The retention of the initial digamma (as against Ἰρβος) proves that, if F. Ribezzo, *RIGI*, 15, 100, is right, the adoption cannot have been later than the fifth century.

¹⁰ See above, p. 34 f.; we must take into account the very ancient piece, discussed by P. Cultrera, *Boll. commun.* 52, 26 f., with the slaying of the Minotaur.

¹¹ Author, *GG.* 177 f., 184 f.

¹² F. Münzer, *Cacus der Rinderdieb* 47 f.; G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 283.

¹³ Author, *GG.* 178 f.

¹⁴ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 283; cp. author, *TM.* 45.

¹⁵ On Cacus, cp. author, *GG.* 184 f.; the literature on Geryoneus is collected in *TM.* 104 n. 2.

¹⁶ K. Meister, *Die Tugenden der Römer* 8, 21 f.

¹⁷ Author, *TM.* 44 f.

¹⁸ L. Malten, *Arch. Jahrb.* 1912, 233 f.; author, *GG.* 183 f.

¹⁹ Author, *GG.* 13 f.; cp. P. Vonder Mühl, *Der grosse Aias* 24 f.; U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 231 f.

²⁰ Author, *GG.* 51 f.

²¹ L. Malten, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 20, 33 f. A. Boethius has shown that, even before Virgil, Ardea formed the centre of legends and great memories; *Roma* 1934, 305 f.

²² *Weltgeschichte* II, 1, 22, 77 f.

²³ W. Mannhardt, *Mythol. Forsch.* 78 f.; J. A. Hild in *Daremborg-Saglio* 8, 1399.

²⁴ *Krit. Beiträge* 164 f.; Preller-Jordan, *Röm. Mythol.* 1, 380 n. 4.

²⁵ *Röm. Gesch.* 1, 52.

²⁶ *Gesch. u. Topogr. d. Stadt Rom* 1, 145 n. 2.

²⁷ *Roman Festivals* 311, 318.

²⁸ *RE.* 6, 2064; *Philol.* 72, 178 f., 191 f.

²⁹ *RuKdR*¹ 488 n. 6; *Mythol. Lex.* 1, 1455; 2, 2162; Marquardt-Wissowa, *Röm. Staatsverwalt.* 3, 439 n. 1.

³⁰ *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 18, 485 f.

³¹ *RuKdR*³ 209.

³² *Lat. etym. Wörterb.*³ 447.

³³ *RE.* 13, 1823, 1835. Cp. M. Leumann in Stolz-Schmalz, *Lat. Gramm.*⁶ 229.

³⁴ *Mythol. Lexik.* 2, 2162; *RuKdR*³ 209.

³⁵ *Op. cit.* 311 n. 2, 312 n. 3.

³⁶ *Op. cit.* 481 n. 1, 489.

³⁷ *RE.* 6, 2056, 2064, 2065; cp. Marbach, *op. cit.* 1885.

³⁸ *Hesychstudien* 38.

³⁹ Cp. W. F. Otto, *op. cit.* 2055.

⁴⁰ *Op. cit.* 2055 f., 2064 f.

⁴¹ The ancient evidence in W. F. Otto, *op. cit.* 2057; cp. A. Walde, *op. cit.* 277; F. Muller, *Altital. Wörterb.* 509.

⁴² W. F. Otto, *op. cit.* 2057 f.

⁴³ F. Sommer, *Handb. d. lat. Laut- u. Formenlehre*³ 109; M. Leumann, *op. cit.* 61; A. v. Blumenthal, *D. Iguvin. Tafeln* 65.

⁴⁴ F. Bücheler, *Rhein. Mus.* 52, 392.

⁴⁵ F. Solmsen, *KZ.* 37, 7.

⁴⁶ A. Walde, *op. cit.* 277.

⁴⁷ Walde-Pokorny, *Vergl. Wörterb. d. indog. Sprachen* 1, 823; P. Kretschmer, *Einl. i. d. Gesch. d. griech. Spr.* 221; F. Solmsen, *KZ.* 34, 77 f.; *Hermes* 46, 286 f.

⁴⁸ E. Sittig, *KZ.* 52, 204 f.

⁴⁹ W. F. Otto, *op. cit.* 2060 f.; G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 211.

⁵⁰ P. Kretschmer, *op. cit.* 214, 221; U. v. Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* 1, 146 n. 5.

⁵¹ F. Solmsen, *Hermes* 46, 287 f.; Walde-Pokorny, *op. cit.* 823. Otherwise E. Fränkel, *Indog. Forsch.* 22, 306 f.; E. Boissacq, *Dict. étymol. de la langue gr.* 361.

⁵² F. Solmsen, *Hermes* 46, 287 f.; Walde-Pokorny, *op. cit.* 823.

⁵³ *Kleinasiat. Forsch.* I, 1, 15 f.

⁵⁴ L. Malten, *Arch. Jahrb.* 1914, 238 n. 20.

⁵⁵ W. F. Otto, *op. cit.* 2061.

⁵⁶ How close the meaning of 'choke, drown' is to that of 'kill' (of which one thinks first in the case of a beast of prey like the wolf) is shown by the transition of meaning from 'kill' to 'choke, throttle' (and then to 'drown'), in Latin *necare*; cp. W. Schulze, *SBAW.* 1918, 322 f. — *Kl. Schrift.* 154 f.; W. Immisch, *Rhein. Mus.* 80, 98 f.

⁵⁷ *Festschr. A. Vendryès zum 3. 7. 1906*; Schrader-Nehring, *Reallex. d. indog. Altertumskunde* 1, 81.

⁵⁸ I have been able to avail myself at this point of the help of J. Weisweiler.

⁵⁹ S. Feist, *Etymol. Wörterb. d. got. Sprache*³ 154, 244, 420.

⁶⁰ J. Grimm, *Deutsche Gramm.* 2 (1826), 62, no. 624; F. Kauffmann, *Beitr. z. Gesch. d. deutschen Spr.* 18, 175; Falk-Torp, *Wortschatz d. german. Spracheinheit* 396 f.; cp. S. Feist, *op. cit.* 244; Walde-Pokorny, *op. cit.* 1, 278.

⁶¹ K. v. Amira, *Grundr. d. german. Rechts*³ 327; J. Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer* 783 f.; R. Schröder, *Lehrb. d. deutsch. Rechtsgesch.*⁶ 81.

⁶² P. Kretschmer, *Einl.* 526 f., 267 f., 271; *Glossa* 12, 278; K.

Brugmann, *Grundr.* I³ 513, 531, 569; N. Jokl, *Reallex. d. Vorgesch.* 6, 41; A. v. Blumenthal, *Indog. Forsch.* 49, 170 f., 175; A. Mayer, *Glotta* 24, 193 f.

⁶³ H. Krahe, *Levik. altillyr. Personennam.* 135.

⁶⁴ Walde-Pokorny, *op. cit.* 1, 323.

⁶⁵ H. Krahe, *Die balkanillyr. geogr. Namen* 89; P. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 22, 162.

⁶⁶ G. Meyer, *Etymolog. Wörterb. d. alban. Sprache* 222.

⁶⁷ *Traité de la formation des mots composés* 171; on the festival *Κνωποπυρς*, cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, *Griech. Heldensage* 2, 230.

⁶⁸ *Kleinasiat. Forsch.* I, 1, 16; *Glotta* 21, 241.

⁶⁹ The literature is collected in *GG.* 148 f.; cp. also O. Gruppe, *Zeitschr. f. alttestamentl. Wissensch.* 39, 70.

⁷⁰ G. Gianelli, *Culti e miti della Magna Grecia* 52 f.

⁷¹ On the meaning of names of similar formation, see U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 447.

⁷² O. Gruppe, *Griech. Myth.* 1380 n. 2; on an epithet of Ares as *θαύλος* or *Θαύλιος*, that is to say, 'throttler' or 'wolf', corresponding to Zeus *Θαύλιος*, cp. F. Müller v. Gärtringen, *Hermes* 46, 154 f.; F. Solmsen, *op. cit.* 289.

⁷³ W. F. Otto, *op. cit.* 2054 f., 2056 f.; the objections of Wissowa (*RuKdR*³ 211) have not succeeded in convincing me.

⁷⁴ Gunning, *RE.* 13, 2403.

⁷⁵ Lykophron 1254 (Timaios) and B. Rehm, *Philol. Suppl.* 24, 2, 28.

⁷⁶ U. v. Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* 1, 147; a note to Aeschylus., *Hic.* 760.

⁷⁷ Author, *GG.* 148 f.

⁷⁸ A. Schwegler, *Röm. Gesch.* 1, 215 n. 21; W. F. Otto, *op. cit.* 2071.

⁷⁹ W. F. Otto, *op. cit.* 2061 f., 2071.

⁸⁰ W. F. Otto, *op. cit.* 2073.

⁸¹ P. Kretschmer, *Einlfg.* 214; on the Iranian *Adai*, *Dahae*, cp. H. Jacobsohn, *Arier u. Ugrofinnen* 154 f.

⁸² W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 262 f.; G. Herbig in *CIE.* 8207; K. Meister, *Griech.-lat. Eigennam.* 1, 81 n. 1; E. Hermann, *Indog. Forsch.* 49, 266.

⁸³ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 145.

⁸⁴ P. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 14, 86.

⁸⁵ G. Wissowa, *Mythol. Lex.* 1, 2693 f.; Otto, *RE.* 8, 1933 f.; on *Soranus* and Etruscan *suri*: S. P. Cortsen, *Glotta* 18, 183 f.; F. Leifer, *Klio, Beih.* 10, 204; *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 30, 221 n. 4.

⁸⁶ *RE.* 6, 2056.

⁸⁷ In the following section I am indebted to W. F. Otto for several suggestions.

⁸⁸ The earlier literature is collected by me in *TM.* 59 f., 104. We must now add *Röm. Mitt.* 45, pl. LIII.

⁸⁹ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 107 n. 6, 225 n. 2; W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 537.

⁹⁰ *Die Götter Griechenlands* 37. No less an authority than Jacob Burckhardt (*Griech. Kulturgesch.* 2, 4 f.) has assigned to this earliest age, as regards its essential nature, the genre of Metamorphoses that later became so popular. Even if many examples of transformation were invented later, in principle, at least, his view hits the mark. For some interesting ideas see now A. Alföldi, *Arch. Anz.* 1931, 398 f.

⁹¹ *Op. cit.* 37 f.; cp. H. Kees, *Vortr. Warburg* 1928-29, 6.

⁹² Author, *TM.* 59 f.

⁹³ U. v. Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 84, 611.

⁹⁴ *GG.* 30 f., where other evidence is quoted. *Nsc.* 1932, 110; *rutile hipocrates* on an Etruscan oinochoe of Vulci.

⁹⁵ W. Schulze, *ZGLEN.* 574 n. 6; P. Kretschmer, *Einl. i. d. Altertumswiss.* I³ 8, 107.

⁹⁶ Author, *GG.* 4 f., 27 f.

⁹⁷ It is certainly all in the same form, if Marica, the mother of Faunus in the Roman tradition, is identified with Circe. On her, see now E. Tabeling, *Mater Larum* 96 n. 2. In other cases, too, Nonnus preserves valuable evidence, without telling us where he found it; cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 213.

⁹⁸ W. F. Otto, op. cit. 2057.

⁹⁹ W. F. Otto, op. cit. 2058.

¹⁰⁰ Cp. G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*¹ 210 f.

¹⁰¹ Wentzel, *RE.* 1, 891.

¹⁰² A. Fick, *KZ.* 58, 67; O. Kern, *Orpheus* 23; cp. F. Bechtel in O. Kern, op. cit. 18.

¹⁰³ A. v. Blumenthal, op. cit. 88.

¹⁰⁴ But cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, *Hellenist. Dicht.* 1, 242 n. 1; and again, F. Pfister, *Burs. Jahresb.* 220, 153 f.

¹⁰⁵ The evidence in A. Schwegler, op. cit. 1, 215.

¹⁰⁶ P. Kretschmer, *Einl. i. d. Gesch. d. griech. Sprache* 280 f.; A. v. Blumenthal, op. cit. 42 f. The excavations seem to have revealed a cult of Odysseus on Ithaca (Luisu cave): G. Karo, *Arch. Anz.* 1931, 266.

¹⁰⁷ *Deutsche Altertumskde* 1, 54.

¹⁰⁸ *Röm. Mythol.*⁵ 2, 308.

¹⁰⁹ A. Schwegler, op. cit. 216 f.; G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 66, 212.

¹¹⁰ W. Schmid, *Griech. Literaturgesch.* 1, 259 n. 3; U. v. Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 84, 611.

¹¹¹ G. Gianelli, op. cit. 52; U. v. Wilamowitz, *Die Ilias u. Homer* 289.

¹¹² That Virgil rests on valuable ancient traditions has recently been shown in one special case by G. Q. Giglioli, *Nsc.* 1930, 843.

¹¹³ H. Krahe, *Die balkanillyr. geogr. Namen* 106 f.

¹¹⁴ *ZGLEN.* 47 f.; cp. E. Norden, *Altgermanien* 262 f.

¹¹⁵ P. Kretschmer, op. cit. 246.

¹¹⁶ P. Kretschmer, *Festschr. Bezzenberger* 89 f.; A. v. Blumenthal, *Die Iguvin. Taf.* 148; E. Norden, op. cit. 279 f.

¹¹⁷ Müller-Deecke, *Die Etrusker* 1, 297 n. 59; H. Krahe, *Lexik. altillyr. Personennam.* 161; *Balkanillyr. geogr. Namen* 91, 108.

¹¹⁸ See above p. 40.

¹¹⁹ *Balkanillyr. geogr. Namen* 80, 107; cp. *Zeitschr. f. Ortsnamenforsch.* 6, 14 n. 3.

BOOK III

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

¹ On the connexion of Southern Italy with Etruria in general, see now E. Ciaceri, *Klio* 23, 457 f.

² On Rome and the Tarquins: G. Pasquali, *Preistoria della poesia Romana* 65 f.; *Nuova Antologia* 1936, 3 f.

³ F. Poulsen, *Antike* 8, 90 f.

⁴ Author, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 29, 29 f.

⁵ Author, *T.M.* 121. Further information in Carter, *Mythol. Lexik.* 3, 2494 f.

⁶ A notable parallel is quoted by A. Alföldi in *Arch. Anz.* 1931, 296; the emigrants, too, the *Picentes*, are sons of the woodpecker.

⁷ J. Lugli, *Forma Italiae*, Regio I. 1, 1, 102 f.; fig. 10.

⁸ K. Lehmann-Hartleben, *Antike* 7, 14 f.

⁹ W. F. Otto, *Der europ. Geist u. die Weisheit des Ostens* 12 f.

¹⁰ On the beginnings of plastic art in Italy, see U. Antonielli, *IPEK.* 1925, 60 f.

¹¹ W. Helbig, *Bull. dell' Inst.* 1879, 76 f., has compared them, because they were stored in earthenware vessels, to the sacred treasures of the Vestals, hidden in *doliola*.

¹² K. Latte, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 24, 245 f.

¹³ K. Latte, *op. cit.* 246.

¹⁴ E. Tabeling, *Mater Larum* 9 f.

¹⁵ C. Koch, *Gestirnerverehrung im alten Italien* 72 f., 98 f.

¹⁶ E. Bickel, *Der altrom. Gottesbegriff* 87 f.

¹⁷ W. Wrede, *Arch. Anz.* 1932, 125 f.; K. Kuruniotis, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 32, 56 f.

¹⁸ On what follows *op. L. Deubner, Röm. Mitt.* 36-7, 17 f.

¹⁹ A polemic against previous views is not possible here.

²⁰ Frank E. Brown, *Mem. Americ. Acad. Rome* 12, 67 f.; A. Boethius, *Gnomon* 11, 590 f.

²¹ A. Boethius, *op. cit.* 593.

²² G. Pinza, *Mon. Linc.* 15, 486; F. v. Duhn, *Ital. Gräberkde* 1, 412.

²³ G. Q. Giglioli, *L'arte Etrusca* pl. LXXV-LXXVI.

²⁴ G. Q. Giglioli, *op. cit.* pl. LXVI.

²⁵ G. Q. Giglioli, *op. cit.* pl. LXVII-LXVIII.

²⁶ Ducati-Giglioli, *Arte Etrusca* 192, fig. 14; G. Q. Giglioli, *op. cit.* pl. CVIII 1.

²⁷ F. Studniczka, *Antike* 4, 177 f.

²⁸ G. Rodenwaldt, *D. Kunst d. Antike* 65 f.

²⁹ A. Kirsopp Lake, *Mem. Amer. Acad. Rome* 12, 122 f.

³⁰ A. Kirsopp Lake, *op. cit.* 101 f.; A. Boethius, *Gnomon* 8, 233 f.

³¹ On the later finds of Etruscan plastic art on the large scale in

terracotta, see F. Poulsen, *Antike* 8, 90 f.; G. A. M. Richter, *Bull. Metrop. Mus.* 1933, 29 f.

³² G. della Seta, *Museo della Villa Giulia* 1, 161, 276; F. Weege in W. Helbig's *Führer*² 2, 353 f.

³³ Ducati-Giglioli, op. cit. 157, fig. 46.

³⁴ Author, *RE.* 15, 1781, 1786; *Studi e materiali di storia delle relig.* 8, 151 f.

³⁵ A. Kirsopp Lake, op. cit. 93 f., 108 f.

³⁶ A. Kirsopp Lake, op. cit. 114 f.

³⁷ Graffunder, *RE.* 1A, 1015, superseding the views of Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 140.

³⁸ M. St. de Rossi, *Ann. dell' Inst.* 1873, 162 f.; 1876, 314 f.; G. Giovannoni, *Nsc.* 1912, 382 f.; A. Kirsopp Lake, op. cit. 127.

³⁹ F. Noack, *Vortr. Warburg* 1925-6, 151 f.

⁴⁰ P. Kretschmer, *Einlfg. i. d. Altertumswiss.* I³ 6, 112.

⁴¹ U. v. Wilamowitz in F. Noack, op. cit. 157 n. 6.

⁴² Author, *TM.* 80 f.

⁴³ *Röm. Forsch.* 2, 45 f.

⁴⁴ Cp. Author, *GG.* 85.

⁴⁵ K. Lehmann-Hartleben, *Antike* 7, 81 f.

⁴⁶ E. Tabeing, *Mater Larum*, Chapter II at the end.

⁴⁷ *RuKdR*² 423.

⁴⁸ F. Messerschmidt, *Studi Etruschi* 3, 519 f.

⁴⁹ The author has given an exhaustive discussion of all questions relating to them in *Welt als Geschichte* 2, 72 f.

^{50a} For all that follows, see C. Koch's book, mentioned in p. vii.

⁵⁰ K. Latte, op. cit. 246; into the details, which are in part inaccurate, I will not enter.

⁵¹ G. Moretti, *Nsc.* 1925, 114 f.; cp. author, *Epochen* II, 298 f. A. Degrassi, *Riv. di fil.*, 1936, 274 f., doubts whether these Fasti are earlier than the Capitoline list of triumphs, but the reasons that he gives prove, one and all, to be invalid on a closer view. The form *Hilur(iis)* is and remains the earliest. Neither *Ilurico* (Fast. Praenest.) nor *Hilyrico* (Dessau 9389) is as old, not to say, more original; the latter is, furthermore, a learned invention, which *Hilur(iis)** certainly is not. To say that *Tab. Barb.* reads *Hillurico*, not *Billurico*, is mere assertion, until the original is checked again. Further, *Veliatib(us)* can only be a mis-writing of the correct *Veleiatibus*; in any case the form is earlier than that offered in its place by the *fast. triumph. Cap.* (on Elea and the Roman Velia, cp. W. Schulze, *Kl. Schrift.* 395 f.). Again, the assertion that the absence of descent is usual for non-Roman Fasti is incorrect. Numbers II, IVb, VII and XII have it; it is missing in VIII, but the piece is of the city of Rome. In IVa it is again wanting, but the list stops in 698/61, and thus agrees admirably with the Fasti of Urbisaglia. In general, descent seems again to be omitted in the post-Augustan age: cp. XVI, XVII, to which V, XI, XV, and perhaps also VI belong. Finally, the assertion that marble was not used for inscriptions in the pre-Caesarian age is wide of the mark. It was not the practice of the city of Rome, but of the neighbourhood of Urbisaglia, that needed to be checked, and there early examples can be found in plenty: CIL. I², 1, 2510 Interamna (time of Sulla; C. Cichorius, *Röm. Stud.* 185 f.); 1904 Teramo, 2085; Arezzo; 2092 Luna; 2122; 2127

Pisaurum; 2129a Rimini; 2130; 2182 Rimini (time of Sulla like as 2181).

⁵² The details have been treated by the author in *Epochen* II, 302 f.

⁵³ H. Diels, *Sibyllin. Blätter* 7 f., 79 f.

⁵⁴ H. Diels, op. cit. 87 f., 104 f.

⁵⁵ Author, *GG.* 163 f.; on Etruscan *smīnthe*—*Σμινθεύς* cp. W. Schulze, *ZGLN.* 473, and E. Fiesel, *Namen d. griech. Mythos im Etrusk.* 59 f., 97.

⁵⁶ M. P. Nilsson, *Die Lit.-Litg.* 1935, 490.

⁵⁷ M. P. Nilsson, *Harvard Theolog. Rev.* 28, 192.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

¹ Author, *GG.* 13 f.

² Author, *GG.* 4 f. On a form of the name supposed to be Etruscan, see M. Buffa, *Studi Etruschi* 7, 451 f.; P. S. Cortsen, *Glossa* 23, 159.

³ M. Hammarström, *Studi Etruschi* 5, 363 f., has with some probability deduced *tinās cliniar* as Etruscan name of the Dioscuri from the inscription on a patera from Tarquinii. He has himself emphasized the fact that my interpretation of the name *Diuturna* is not thereby refuted (op. cit. 368 f.). In other cases, too, various forms of names occur; *Mercurius* and *turms*, *Volcanus* and *śeulans*—they show a certain independence on the part of Latium under Etruscan influence. For this area a mixed form of Etruscan and Latin like *Diuturna* is as probable as it is impossible for Etruria proper. How little we can count on a single name is shown by the fact that the sons of Zeus in Pelignian were called *Iovies pocles* (as also among the Marsians).

⁴ Author, *GG.* 26 f.

⁵ A. Boethius, *Bull. degli studi mediterr.* 1931, 2, 1 f.; 1932, 6, 21 f.; 1934, 1-2, 1 f.; *Arkeologiska studier tillägnade H.K.H. Kronprins Gustaf Adolf* 18 f.; *Roma* 1934, 291 f.; *Atti III. Congr. Naz. studi Romani* 147 f.

⁶ K. Meister, *Griech.-latein. Eigennam.* 1, 113 f. On the designation as *Castores*, cp. E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica* 1, 61 f.; P. Vonder Mühl, *Der grosse Aias* 31 n. 71.

⁷ *Les origines de l'Hercule Romain* (1926).

⁸ The proof offered by Bayet, op. cit. 477, for the greater age of the cult at the Porta Trigemina is by no means convincing. I should prefer to abide by the older view.

⁹ *RuKdR*³ 272.

¹⁰ Excepting, of course, the Greek deities of the earliest calendar. We might also put it in the form, that the lack of a special position is common to those deities with Hercules. This would indicate a very early date for him, too; he would be even earlier than the cult of Juturna and the Dioscuri, which already seems to imply such a special position for the foreign cults, and shows regard for a sacred boundary of the city.

¹¹ F. Bayet, op. cit. 478; cp. 296, 324.

¹² On the Roman Dioscuri, cp. H. Usener, *Kl. Schriften* 4, 312.

¹³ *Der grosse Aias* (1930).

¹⁴ W. F. Otto, *D. Götter Griechenlands* 21 f., 38. In the same way

the appellation of Aias *Πηλώριος* belongs to *Γαῖα πελώρη* (P. Vonder Mühl, *op. cit.* 10).

¹⁵ Author, *GG.* 22 f.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.* 396 f.; *cp.* E. Tabeling, *Mater Larum* 45 f., 57 f.

¹⁷ The 'heathen element' in his attitude to religion has been deemed worthy of a special paragraph by his greatest biographer, Goethe; nothing is more perverse than to deny to Winckelmann any religion at all, as has lately been done. As regards Apollo, if I am not very much mistaken, a reference to the illuminating and liberating comments of F. Justi (*Winckelmann* II, 1, 50) will still be of use.

¹⁸ On what follows, see W. F. Otto, *Die Götter Griechenlands* 19 f. The sentences that I have written on the Homeric gods are also based on his formulations.

¹⁹ W. F. Otto, *D. europ. Geist u. d. Weisheit des Ostens* 23 f.

²⁰ Author, *Welt als Geschichte* 2, 70 f.

²¹ Author, *Epochen* I, 124 f.

²² J. Frank, *Mem. Amer. Acad. Rome* 5, 79 f.; Th. Ashby, *Journ. Rom. Stud.* 1929, 161 f.

²³ Author, *GG.* 46 f.

²⁴ Author, *GG.* 71.

²⁵ E. Kornemann, *Internat. Monatsschr.* 14, 491 f.; *cp.* D. M. Robinson, *Antike* 11, 289.

²⁶ B. Nogara, *Nsc.* 1930, 302 f.; author, *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* 8, 146 f.

²⁷ A. Kirsopp Lake, *op. cit.* 100.

²⁸ On Mercurius *GG.* 39 f.; on Diana *GG.* 93 f.; on Minerva *RE.* 15, 1774 f.

²⁹ For this and what follows, see *GG.* 139 f. The Bacchiadae also appear as founders of Syracuse: H. Hasebroek, *Griech. Wirtschafts-u. Gesellschaftsgesch.* 119.

³⁰ In the Greek calendars, on the other hand, no such shaping will can be discerned; *cp.* U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 36 n. 1.

³¹ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 39 f.; on the relation of the cult of Diana on the Aventine to that at Aricia, see *GG.* 129 f.

³² Author, *GG.* 137 f.

³³ M. P. Nilsson, *Deutsche Lit.-Ztg.* 1930, 2226.

³⁴ Author, *GG.* 143 f.

³⁵ M. P. Nilsson, *op. cit.* 2226.

³⁶ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 285 f.

³⁷ Used here in the sense that reminds us of the present-day Campagna: *Thesaur. ling. lat., Onom.* 123, l. 77 f.

³⁸ Author, *TM.* 102 f., 142.

³⁹ Horat., *Sat.* 1, 5, 24 f.; J. Lugli, *Circei (Forma Italiae, reg. 1, vol. 1, 2),* 59 f.

⁴⁰ *Hermes* 19, 463 f.

⁴¹ Recorded in this form and to be retained. The subjunctive in the hypothetical period (*cp.* Horat., *c.* 4, 4, 65) is the same as in the first clause introduced by *si* (J. B. Hofmann in Stolz-Schmalz, *Lat. Gramm.*⁶ 773, § 336). To our case would correspond Livy 10, 19, 17, *Bellona, si hodie nobis victoriam duit, ast ego templum tibi uoveo.* In general, *cp.* F. B. Hofmann, *op. cit.* 688, § 264e; 770, § 334, and the literature quoted there.

⁴² *Rhein. Mus.* 41, 1 f. = *Kl. Schrift.* 3.

⁴³ E. Fraenkel, *Hermes* 62, 357 f.; author, *Glotta* 19, 24 f.; *TM.* 103 n. 2.

⁴⁴ *Poet. philos. fragm.* (Diels) p. 222, fr. 16; L. Mitteis, *Reichsrecht und Volksrecht* 376; K. Latte, *Heiliges Recht* 107.

⁴⁵ Bucheler had adduced the Laconian inscription IG. V 1, 1155, which, as it was placed on a stone seat and mentioned a slave, he interpreted in the sense of the rite of Tarracina. Quite a different interpretation is given by W. Kolbe. The monument is, both in point of language and content, far too little explained to be used with advantage in any connexion.

⁴⁶ On this question, cp. H. Usener, *Kl. Schrift.* 4, 356 f.; I. Wenger, *Der heutige Stand der röm. Rechtswiss.* 56 f.; E. Bruck, *Totentheil und Seelgerät*, Einlg. IX.

⁴⁷ *Op. cit.* 106 f.

⁴⁸ Paton-Hicks, *Inscriptions of Cos* nr. 29.

⁴⁹ Cp. F. Marx, *Plautus' Rudens* 149 (v. 688); U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 2, 319 n. 5; again A. v. Blumenthal, *Klio* 27, 2 n. 7.

⁵⁰ *Rom. Strafrecht* 458 f.; cp. F. v. Woess, *D. Asylwesen i. d. Ptolemäerzeit* 206 f.

⁵¹ *RuKdR*² 474 n. 3.

⁵² Cp. author, *Epochen I*, 141 f.; *Welt als Geschichte* 2, 74. Asylum in the shrine of Vesta is presupposed by the story of the murder of the praetor Sempronius Asellio, Appian, *b. civ.* 1, 54. We should also mention the *fanum fugitivi*: H. Nissen, *Ital. Landeskde* 2, 1, 404.

⁵³ On *lucus* as description of the asylum, cp. Flor. 1, 1; Ovid., *Fast.* 3, 431; Vergil, *Aen.* 8, 342.

⁵⁴ On the asylum of Romulus, cp. J. B. Carter, *Mythol. Lex.* 4, 184 f. Jordan, *Topogr. d. Stadt Rom.* 1, 2, 117 f.; Th. Mommsen, *op. cit.* 459; Rosenberg, *RE.* 1A, 1093 f.; A. Schwegler, *Röm. Gesch.* 1, 464 f.; Stengel, *RE.* 2, 1885; F. v. Woess, *op. cit.* 43 n. 2, 206.

⁵⁵ Cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, *Aristoteles und Athen* 2, 50; author, *Epochen I*, 131.

⁵⁶ *Heilige Gesetze aus Kos* 36; cp. 56.

⁵⁷ U. v. Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 22, 246 f.; Aischylos, *Interpretationen* 12 f.; J. Hasebroek, *Gnomon* 9, 574.

⁵⁸ S. Ferri, *Notiziario archeolog.* 4, 93 f.; U. v. Wilamowitz, *SBAW.* 1927, 155 f.; K. Latte, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 26, 41; *Gnomon* 9, 411 n. 1.

⁵⁹ K. Latte, *op. cit.* 48.

⁶⁰ J. Hasebroek, *Griech. Wirtschafts und Gesellschaftsgesch.* 93 f.

⁶¹ The *ἱεὺς*, it is true, is not necessarily identical with the man who has sought an asylum. But the *hetaera* is the wider conception, including the *ἀστυλα* (F. v. Woess, *op. cit.* 75). It denoted the resort to a sacred spot of any kind, whether that is the hearth of a foreign friend or a shrine. The right of asylum, on the other hand, represents only a special case, so that it is permissible to adduce the nature of the *hetaera* to explain it.

⁶² U. v. Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* 170.

⁶³ F. Leo, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* 1, 331 n. 1; cp. Schanz-Hosius, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* 1⁴, 196.

⁶⁴ O. Jahn, *Ber. Sächs. Akad.* 1847, 416 f.; Preller-Robert, *Griech. Mythol.* 1, 254 f.; Weniger, *Mythol. Lexik.* 2, 3181; Ganszyniec,

RE. 13, 2384 f. (his view, that the passage in Servius Dan. refers to the Delphic hero himself, is at once refuted by the context); W. Immerwahr, *D. Kulte u. Mythen Arkadiens* 1, 22.

⁸⁵ H. Usener, *Götternamen*³ 11 f.; on two occurrences of the form *Αυδώνης*, cp. O. Jahn, op. cit. 417.

⁸⁶ H. Usener, *Sinfätsagen* 77.

⁸⁷ O. Jahn, op. cit. 423 f.; O. Gruppe, *Griech. Mythol.* 918 f., 1296; Preller-Robert, op. cit. 1, 254; author, *GG.* 148 f.

⁸⁸ O. Jahn, op. cit. 423.

⁸⁹ P. Kretschmer, *Kleinasiat. Forsch.* 1, 1, 14 f.

⁹⁰ U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 147 n. 2.

⁹¹ On the following, see W. F. Otto, *RE.* 6, 2055 f., 2064 f.; *Wiener Stud.* 35, 69 f.

⁹² W. F. Otto, *RE.* 6, 2056 f.

⁹³ Anziani, *Mélanges d'arch. et d'hist.* 30, 257 f.; P. Ducati, *Rendic. dei Linc.* 24, 540 f.; L. Malten, *Arch. Jahrb.* 1914, 438 n. 20; cp. 236 n. 4.

⁹⁴ *TM.* 59 f.

⁹⁵ F. Weege, *Etrusk. Malerei* pl. LXII.

⁹⁶ P. Ducati, op. cit. 542; author, *TM.* 104.

⁹⁷ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 237 n. 7.

⁹⁸ G. Wissowa, op. cit. 237.

⁹⁹ The law passed at a later date into the laws of the Twelve Tables; cp. Th. Mommsen, *Röm. Forsch.* 1, 384 n. 52.

¹⁰⁰ A wooden statue in Rome of the second century before Christ should not surprise us after the most recent finds in Pompeii and Herculaneum (W. Technau, *Gnomon* 7, 221); *duo signa cupressae Iunonis reginae* Livy 27, 27, 12, in the procession of 207 B.C.

¹⁰¹ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 238; O. Immisch, *Aus Roms Zeitwende* 32.

¹⁰² G. Wissowa, op. cit. 238.

¹⁰³ K. Sauer, *Unters. z. Darst. d. Todes* (Frankf. Diss. 1980) 22. The notice that we have quoted further shows that later times diverged from the use of asylum in the earliest period. The reason cannot be in doubt. It has always been seen that the fully developed Roman law took up an unfriendly attitude to this institution. The reason is to be sought, not so much in any national peculiarity, as in the fact that the interference with the regular course of punishment, which the claim to sanctuary involved, was bound to come into hopeless conflict with the beginning of systematic development of the idea of law (F. v. Woess, op. cit. 112, 179; *Epochen* I, 146 f.). It is important to realize that, on the Greek side, too, hints of a similar attitude to the right of asylum are manifest (author, *Klio* 20, 265 f.; cp. S. Luria, *Hermes* 61, 844 n.).

¹⁰⁴ Author, *Welt als Geschichte* 2, 76 f.

¹⁰⁵ Author, *GG.* 164.

¹⁰⁶ *Indog. Forsch.* 42, 95 f.

¹⁰⁷ *Sitz. Ber. Bayer. Akad.* 1980, Heft 1; E. Fiesel, *Gesch. d. indog. Sprachwiss.* II, 5, 4, 61 f.

¹⁰⁸ I had long since written what stands in the text, when I saw that E. Fiesel had, in the meantime, expressed a similar guess (*RE.* 15, 935).

¹⁰⁹ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 41; H. Usener, *Rhein. Mus.* 56, 30.

¹¹⁰ G. Wissowa, op. cit. 41, 254; *Mythol. Lexik.* 2, 2984.

⁹¹ The excavations of H. Payne at Perachora, near Corinth, have revealed a temple with three 'cellae', with a base for the cult-image in the central 'cella'; G. Karo recalls the Etruscan temple (*Arch. Anz.* 1931, 255).

⁹² On the following, cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* 71.

⁹³ U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 73.

⁹⁴ U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 78 f.

⁹⁵ Cp. author, *GG.* 88; *TM.* 25 f.

⁹⁶ J. Hasebroek, op. cit. 274.

⁹⁷ Oldfather, *RE.* 18, 1313.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

¹ F. Barnabei, *Nsc.* 1896, 99 f., 190 f.; E. Petersen, *Röm. Mitt.* 11, 157 f. What follows is mainly based on the work of H. Koch, who allowed me access to the material that he has collected. Cp. F. Studniczka, *Antike* 4, 197.

² H. Koch, *Gnomon* 3, 400.

³ On what follows, compare author, *TM.* 83 f.; *Epochen* 1, 126 f.; *Welt als Geschichte* 2, 70 f.

⁴ *TM.* 36 f. Against this, see K. Latte, *Zwei Exk. z. röm. Staatsr.* 74 n. 2, but compare the note that follows.

⁵ Author, *Studi e materiali di storia delle relig.* 8, 158 f.; cp. R. Thurneysen, *Glotta* 21, 7 f.; P. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 21, 100; E. Vetter, *Glotta* 23, 188; A. v. Blumenthal, *Indog. Forsch.* 54, 112 f.; J. B. Hofmann, *Glotta* 25, 119.

⁶ A. della Seta, *Museo di villa Giulia* 1, 253, 280, 303 f.

⁷ *TM.* 95 f.; for a new attempt to explain the name, see U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 100 f.; but see also 2, 549.

⁸ Thus Demeter-Ceres appears as 'nurse' or 'foster-mother' (**Amma*, Ἀμμάς) on the Oscan inscription of Agnone. Anna Perenna, too, may belong to the same context; the attempt to question this interpretation has failed to convince me. As a further parallel we may mention the goddess Ἄννα, who meets us in Acras in Sicily beside the Παῖδες or θεαὶ Παῖδες (P. Orsi, *Nsc.* 1920, 327 f.; cp. 1899, 452 f.; U. v. Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* 102 n. 1; *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 1, 243 n. 1; O. Kern, *Relig. d. Griech.* 1, 130; cp. also Th. Vetter, *Glotta* 20, 67 f.).

⁹ That the foundation of the temple of Mercurius, as well, followed on the ground of the Sibylline Books (G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 304; cp. *GG.* 82 n. 4) is a mere guess. The share in the *lectisternium* of 399 no more proves introduction by the oracle for this god than it does for Diana, Hercules and Neptunus; the less so, as Mercurius seems to have been known in Rome even before 405.

¹⁰ *TM.* 84. In the account of the history of Aristodemus of Cyme, mythical as it is (Plutarch, *de mul. virtut.* 261 E f.), Xenocrite becomes priestess of Demeter after the death of the tyrant. As early as the end of the sixth century, then, a cult of the goddess would have existed there—a fact of importance not only for the earlier adoption of Ceres-Demeter, but also for the triad Ceres, Liber and Libera in particular. In the Carthaginian cult of Demeter the priestesses were

likewise Greeks : Timaios in Diodor. 14, 77, 5 ; cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 2, 327 n. 1.

¹¹ U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 2, 233 f.

¹² W. F. Otto, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 12, 533 f.

¹³ *RuKdR*² 51, 306 f. ; cp. also *TM*. 17.

¹⁴ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 59 n. 2.

¹⁵ See also author, *Welt als Geschichte* 2, 76 f.

¹⁶ Compare my narrative in *RE*. 8A, 2061 f.

¹⁷ On the question of this 'hiatus' here and in the following section, compare : author, *Epochen* I, 158 f. ; *Welt als Geschichte* 2, 86 f. ; M. P. Nilsson, *Einl. i. d. Altertumswiss.* II⁴ 4, 101 ; *Die Lit.-Ztg.* 1935, 491 ; U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 2, 333, 335 ; G. Pasquali, op. cit. 61 f. ; Inez Scott Ryberg, *Amer. Journ. Arch.* 1932, 100 f. On a similar phenomenon in Spain, cp. author, *Epochen* II, 182 f.

¹⁸ The question, whether on the Greek side, too, a similar interruption can be observed could only be settled by a more extensive inquiry.

¹⁹ *Zeitschr. f. dt. Altertum* 66, 223 f.

²⁰ C. Marstrander, *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 1, 85 f. ; M. Hammarström, *Studier i nordisk filologi* 20 ; W. Krause, *Gnomon* 7, 488 f. ; H. Arntz, *Handb. d. Runenkde* 85 f. ; author, *Welt als Geschichte* 3, 114 f.

²¹ F. Messerschmidt, *Arch. Jahrb.* 45, 62 f. ; A. Rumpf, *Einl. i. d. Altertumswiss.* II⁴ 3, 81.

²² *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* 4, 286 f. ; *Atti del I Congresso internat. etrusco* 117 f. ; *Klio* 23, 147 f.

²³ P. Ducati, *Historia* 6, 7, 22 f. ^{23a} But cp. *Welt als Gesch.* 2, 88 f.

²⁴ F. Bueckhardt, *Griech. Kulturgesch.* 1, 171 ; cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 2, 84.

²⁵ W. Helbig, *Hermes* 40, 106 f. ; F. Weege, *Arch. Jahrb.* 24, 140 ; author, *GG.* 20 ; cp. also J. Hasebroek, *Griech. Wirtschafts u. Gesellschaftsgesch.* 79.

²⁶ A. A. Blumenthal *Die Iguvin. Tafeln* 36 f.

²⁷ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 268 ; cp. author, *GG.* 17 f.

²⁸ On the *Aekii Lamiae*, cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 1, 273 n. 1. We might also remember *Erulus* and the gens *Feronia* or *Caeculus* and the gens *Caecilia* (*GG.* 176 f. ; *Epochen* I, 287). For an apposite comment, see U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 1, 142.

²⁹ U. v. Wilamowitz, *Griech. Verskunst* 33 n. 1 ; G. Pasquali, op. cit. 74.

³⁰ F. Leo, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* 1, 153.

³¹ *Arch. Jahrb.* 24, 99 f.

³² F. Leo, *Der saturn. Vers* 65 f. ; G. Pasquali, op. cit. 53 f.

³³ Strabo 5 p. 250 (*μυλῆλλες*) ; cp. E. Ciaceri, *Storia della Magna Grecia* 2, 474 f. ; W. Hofmann, *Rom. u. die griech. Welt* (*Philol. Suppl.* 27, 1), 46.

³⁴ Author, *TM.* 11 f. ; U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 2, 337.

³⁵ Author, *TM.* 12 f.

³⁶ On this question, see H. Krahe, *Glotta* 19, 148 f., 287 f. ; author, *Glotta* 20, 186 f.

³⁷ A. v. Blumenthal, *Hesychstudien* 10 f.

³⁸ Author, *Epochen* 1, 174 f.

³⁹ That the equal rights of all citizens were at first only nominal is another story.

⁴⁰ F. Leo, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* 1, 41.

⁴¹ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 274; J. Bayet, *Les origines de l'Hercule Romain* 248 f.; G. Rohde, *Die Kultsätze der röm. Pontifices* 120.

⁴² *Röm. Forsch.* 2, 58 f.

⁴³ Cp. also H. Strassburger, *Concordia ordinum* (Frankf. Diss. 1931) 4 f., 125; U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 2, 808 n. 1; unjustified doubts in E. Skard, *Zwei relig.-polit. Begriffe* 102 f.; remains of the shrine: *Mem. Amer. Acad. Rome* 5, 55 f.

⁴⁴ F. Münzer, *Röm. Adelspart.* 83 f.; author, *Numism. Chronicle* 1937 (special Congress number).

⁴⁵ For the new dating, cp. H. Mattingly, *Journ. Rom. Stud.* 1929, 19 f.; H. Mattingly and E. S. G. Robinson, *The date of the Roman denarius*, *Proceed. Brit. Acad.* XVIII; *Amer. Journ. Philol.* 56, 225 f.

⁴⁶ K. Latte, *Gnomon* 7, 121 n. 2, has been the last to discuss the form of the name. For the mention of an earlier shrine *extra urbem* (Plinius, n. h. 29, 16), cp. A. Bartoli, *Rendic. dei Lincei* 1917, 573 f.

⁴⁷ R. Herzog, *D. Wunderheilungen von Epidaurus* 54, 114.

⁴⁸ L. Deubner, *Neue Jahrb.* 9, 385; author, *GG.* 25. On the connexion of Asklepios with spring and snake, cp. R. Herzog, op. cit. 112 f.; the same connexion occurs for the Dioscuri, to whose cult Juturna belongs: *GG.* 20 f.

⁴⁹ K. Latte, op. cit. 121 n. 2.

⁵⁰ K. Latte, op. cit. 119 f.; R. Herzog, op. cit. 38 f. Pausanias, 3, 28, 6 f., reports a contemporary foundation of a branch-shrine, which points to considerable similarity with the course of the Roman. In the history of the Asclepium of Corinth, which actually goes back into the sixth century, a new era begins with the year 888: G. Karo, *Arch. Anz.* 1932, 185.

⁵¹ U. Wilcken, *Alexander der Grosse* 292. On the importance of the time-boundary, cp. author, *Epochen* I, 206 f.; II, 18 f.; *Welt als Geschichte* 2, 90 f.

⁵² H. Diels, *Sibyllin. Blätter* 84 f.; G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 60 f.

⁵³ U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 1, 329 f.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

¹ On the supposed year of introduction, 105 B.C., cp. F. Münzer, *RE.* 1A, 1273; *Gnomon* 12, 648.

² L. Malten, *Röm. Mitt.* 38, 39, 328 f.

³ S. Bocconi, *Musei Capitolini* 289 f., 291. In this context belongs also the Sarcophagus of Scipio Barbatus, which dates to the second century B.C. and still shows Etruscan influence: P. Nicorescu, *Ephem. Dacoromana* 1, 46 f.

⁴ F. Matz, *Atlantis* 1929, 762; B. Delbrück, *Die drei Tempel am Forum Holitorium* 44 f., 49 f.; cp. also A. Boethius, *Gnomon* 8, 238.

⁵ K. Meister, *Griech.-latein. Eigennam.* 1, 78 f., 80.

⁶ C. Cichorius, *Rom. Stud.* 7 f., 19 f.; cp. H. Schwenn, *Menschenopfer b. d. Griechen u. Römern* 148 f. For a supposed representation of the sacrifice, cp. R. Herbig, *Arch. Anz.* 1934, 528—I do not find it convincing.

⁷ But cp. F. Leifer, *Zum Problem d. Forumsinschrift* (Klio Beih. 27), 10 n. 2.

⁸ *Plautin. im Plautus*. 179 f.

⁹ G. Pasquali, *Studi etruschi* 1, 291 f.; cp. *Pagine meno stravaganti di un filologo* 170 f.

¹⁰ On what follows, cp. author, *TM*. 2 f.; cp. also E. Diehl, *Rhein. Mus.* 88, 246 f.

¹¹ On the name of *Proserpina*, see *TM*. 15 f.; *Dis*, it is well known, is a direct translation. The idea of the wealth of the chthonic deities was widespread in Rome, too. Ennius, in the *Iphigenia* (fr. 202 Ribbeck), renders the *καθαριν . . . μοι δέδονται* of the original by: *Acherontem obibo, ubi Mortis thesauri obiacent*; cp. E. Fraenkel, op. cit. 181; E. Tabeling, *Mater Larum* 48 f.

¹² I regard the attempt at explanation in St. Weinstock, *Gnomon* 12, 658, as just as unsatisfactory as the older one, which he discusses in *Glotta* 21, 43 f.

¹³ The counter-arguments of L. Banti (*Studi Etr.* 5, 684), acute as they are in themselves, have not succeeded in making me waver in my view. Above all, I would observe that the force of my argument, that a new introduction from the *Graecus ritus* must not be attributed to the *pontifices*, seems not to be affected thereby; cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 2, 337, and author, *Epochen* I, 232 p. 161-2.

¹⁴ E. Fraenkel, op. cit. 339 f., 344 f.

¹⁵ U. Wilcken, op. cit. 292.

¹⁶ We should not, however, dispute the fact that the consultation of the oracles, preliminary to the reception of a new cult (the *ludi Tarentini*, for example), could only take place by a decree of the senate. Even so, the final issue of the consultation (character and expression of the cult) remained as before outside the competence of the senate.

¹⁷ For a further guess, cp. O. Weinreich, *Genethliakon W. Schmid* 392.

¹⁸ Author, *TM*. 54 n. 1.

¹⁹ E. Fraenkel, op. cit. 149 f.

²⁰ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 463 n. 4; H. Graillet, *Le culte de Cybèle* 86.

²¹ M. Gelzer, *Philol.* 86, 285 f.

²² B. Delbrück, *Hellenist. Bauten in Latium* 2, 174 f.

²³ F. Messerschmidt, *Röm. Mitt.* 46, 74 f.

²⁴ K. Kerényi, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 30, 271 f.; J. Carcopino, *La basilique pythagoricienne de la Porte Majeure* 169 f.

²⁵ Author, *TM*. 4 f.

²⁶ F. Bücheler, *Kl. Schrift.* 2, 412; W. Schulze, *Kl. Schrift.* 392.

²⁷ F. Weege, *Arch. Jahrb.* 24, 101 f., 129, pl. VII.

²⁸ E. Norden, *Aeneis* VI² 171 f.; K. Kerényi, *Hermes* 66, 241 f.; 67, 132.

²⁹ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 301 n. 2; *RE.* 3, 1978. The figure represented is interpreted as Proserpina herself by E. Cahen, *Daremberg-Saglio* IV, 1, 696; E. Gerhardt, *Arch. Zig.* 8, 146 f.; L. R. Farnell, *The Cult of the Greek States* 3, 228, pl. XI.

³⁰ R. Paribeni, *Nsc.* 1930, 370 f., 378 f.

³¹ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*¹ 300 f.

³² Author, *TM*. 152 f. On Demeter and the 'dactylic' Hercules, cp. B. Schweitzer, *Gnomon* 4, 191; O. Kern, *Orpheus* 54; U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 1, 279.

³³ *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 30, 271 f., 284 f.

³⁴ As we shall have to go deeply into the case of the Bacchanalia at this point and later, we must briefly define our attitude to the most recent research on the subject. I believe that the essay of E. Fraenkel (*Hermes* 67, 369 f.) has been refuted by J. Keil (op. cit. 68, 306 f.) and M. Gelzer (op. cit. 71, 278 f.). With equal scepticism, however, must I regard Gelzer's own views of the annalistic insertion of the report in Livy. I cannot here express my doubts in detail, but must simply point out that at least the account of the rise of the Bacchanalian mysteries and their subsequent degeneration (8, 3, -14, 3) is excellent, and is confirmed by archaeological evidence. M. P. Nilsson (*Die. Lit. Ztg.* 1935, 491) has already reminded us of the picture on a vase (*Ann. dell' Inst.* 1845 pl. M) and of its obscenities, that agree well with the practices thrown in the teeth of the Bacchae. Duryonia, the mother of P. Aebutius, who initiates him among the Bacchae, has been identified by R. Paribeni (*Nsc.* 1930, 370) on the inscription of the Valle Ariccia, which shows this woman as participant in a cult of Ceres-Demeter, which in itself points to South Italy and Sicily. We shall not, then, be disposed to attack this particular part of the narrative of Livy.

³⁵ R. Reitzenstein, *D. hellenist. Mysterienrelig.*³ 102 f., 192.

³⁶ F. Cumont, *Die oriental. Religionen*³ 316 f., nr. 26.

³⁷ E. Rohde, *Psyche*¹⁰ 2, 374 n. 3.

³⁸ *Diss. d. Pont. Acad. Rom. di archeol.* 14, 158 f.

³⁹ *Mon. Linc.* 22, 578 f.

⁴⁰ U. v. Wilamowitz, *Nordion. Steine* 14 f.

⁴¹ *Studi ital. di filol. class.* 7, 98 n. 2.

⁴² A. Vogliano and F. Cumont, *Amer. Journ. Arch.* 37, 215 f.

⁴³ Cp. *Bacas adire* in *SC. de Bacchanalibus*: E. Fraenkel, op. cit. 67, 370.

⁴⁴ Here we need only mention L. Curtius, *Die pompeianische Wandmaleriei* 343 f.; M. Bieber, *Arch. Jahrb.* 43, 298 f.

⁴⁵ A. Maiuri, *La villa dei misteri* 166.

⁴⁶ F. Messerschmidt, *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* 5, 26; U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 2, 387.

⁴⁷ G. Bandinelli, *Compendio di storia dell' arte etrusca e Romana* 176 f., fig. 135; G. Q. Giglioli, *Arte etrusca CCCXCI* 2.

⁴⁸ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 313; *Mythol. Lexik.* 2, 2798 f.; Marbach, *RE.* 15, 936 f.

⁴⁹ W. F. Otto, *RE.* 6, 2281 f.

⁵⁰ U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 1, 26 f.

⁵¹ Marbach, op. cit. 936. ^{51a} But cp. U. Knoche, *Gnomon* 4, 602.

⁵² *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* 1, 73.

⁵³ E. Fraenkel, *RE. Suppl.* 5, 604.

⁵⁴ F. Weege, *Etrusk. Malerei* pl. LXIII f.; F. Messerschmidt, *Arch. Jahrb.* 45, 82 f.

⁵⁵ *Mon. Linc.* 24 pl. III-IV.

⁵⁶ E. Fiesel, *Namen des griech. Mythos im Etrusk.* 48 f.

⁵⁷ E. Brunn, *I rilievi delle urne etrusche* 1, 113 f.

⁵⁸ Proofs in Höfer, *Mythol. Lexik.* 8, 634 f.; G. Gianelli, *Culti e miti della Magna Grecia* 182 f., 201, 202 f., 206.

⁵⁹ P. Kretschmer, *Einl. i. d. Gesch. d. griech. Sprache* 280 f.; cp. A. v. Blumenthal, *Hesychstud.* 42 f.

⁶⁰ Pointed out to me by K. Kerényi (cp. *Apollon* 132 f.). Further information, of a remarkable character, on the Etruscan Odysseus in *Mythol. Lexik.* 3, 6 f.

⁶¹ B. Bianchi-Bandinelli, *Sovana* 93, 112; *Gnomon* 10, 75.

⁶² Cp. C. Brakmann, *Mnemosyne* 60, 371 f. I only know the essay of G. B. Pighi, *Il proemio degli annali di Q. Ennio* (*Publ. Univ. Catol. del sacro cuore ser.* IV, vol. V), from the summary of its contents in *Bursians Jahresber.* 242, 67 f.

⁶³ U. v. Wilamowitz, *Hellenist. Dichtg.* 2, 92 f.; E. Reitzenstein, *Festschrift R. Reitzenstein* 52 f. On the scene of the dream in the prelude to the *Aitia*, cp. now the discussion by H. Herter, *Bursians Jahresber.* 255, 114 f., who gives a good survey of the material recently added (*Florent. Comm.* I. 16) and the whole literature relative to it.

⁶⁴ E. Reitzenstein, op. cit. 58 f.

⁶⁵ E. Reitzenstein, op. cit. 41 f.

⁶⁶ *Enn. poes. rel.* CXLVII n. 2.

⁶⁷ Op. cit. 63 f.

⁶⁸ Op. cit. 1, 164 f.; cp. also E. Reitzenstein, op. cit. 57 n. 2.

⁶⁹ F. Leo, op. cit. 1, 164 n. 1; E. Reitzenstein, op. cit. 67 f.

⁷⁰ F. Leo, op. cit. 1, 164 n. 2; E. Reitzenstein, op. cit. 61, 64 f.

⁷¹ E. Reitzenstein, op. cit. 69.

⁷² E. Reitzenstein, op. cit. 66, 69.

⁷³ That Ennius and Callimachus represent two mutually exclusive worlds I have shown in *Epochen* II, 142 f.

⁷⁴ Vahlen in *fr.* 15.

⁷⁵ Many accounts were given of the previous births of Pythagoras; cp. E. Rohde, *Psyche*¹⁰ 2, 417 f.

⁷⁶ On the Pythagoreans of South Italy, cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, *Plato* 2, 82 f.

⁷⁷ W. Jaeger, *SBBA.* 1928, 417 n. 8.

⁷⁸ Cp. F. Weege in O. Weinreich, *Triskaidekadische Studien* 120.

⁷⁹ A. Furtwängler, *Antike Gemmen* 3, 258 f.; the other literature is quoted in F. Messerschmidt, *Studi e materiali di storia della religione* 5, 26 n. 6.

⁸⁰ W. Nestle, *Philol. Suppl.* 8, 607 f.; F. Leo, op. cit. 1, 200 n. 1.

⁸¹ U. v. Wilamowitz, *Teutgesch. d. griech. Lyriker* 24 f.; H. Diels, *Vorsokratiker*⁵ 1, 190 f.; W. Crönert, *Hermes* 47, 402 f.; F. Leo, op. cit. 1, 201 n. 2; F. Jacoby, *Theognis* 38 f.

⁸² A. Dieterich, *Nekyia* 182; F. Leo, op. cit. 200 f.; cp. also A. Furtwängler, op. cit. 260 n. 2.

⁸³ F. Jacoby, op. cit. 39.

⁸⁴ A. Dieterich, op. cit. 128 f.

⁸⁵ E. Norden, op. cit. 21 f.

⁸⁶ E. Norden, op. cit. 21 n. 8.

⁸⁷ A. Dieterich, op. cit. pp. 132 f., has shown that this tradition was not interrupted, even in later times.

⁸⁸ E. Reitzenstein, op. cit. 66; M. Pohlenz, *Festschrift R. Reitzenstein* 100 n. 2.

⁸⁹ On the origin of the conception cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 2, 535.

⁹⁰ Compared with the *cursus honorum* by R. Harder, *Cicero's Somnium Scipionis* (*Schriften d. Königsberger Gel. Gesellsch.* 6) 136.

⁹¹ M. Pohlenz, op. cit. 101.

- ⁹² R. Harder, op. cit. 140.
⁹³ R. Harder, op. cit. 141.
⁹⁴ R. Harder, op. cit. 188 f.
⁹⁵ E. Norden, op. cit. 17 f.; A. Dieterich, op. cit. 158 f.
⁹⁶ E. Norden, op. cit. 21 n. 3.
⁹⁷ W. F. Otto, *Vergil* 18.
⁹⁸ E. Norden, op. cit. 16 f.
⁹⁹ H. Lothar, *Der Pfau in d. altchristl. Kunst (Stud. über christl. Denkmäler N. F. 18)* 49 f.; R. Reitzenstein, *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium* 227 f.
¹⁰⁰ Op. cit. 3, 268 f.; cp. H. Lothar, op. cit. 28.
¹⁰¹ Op. cit. 3, 257 f.; J. Carcopino, op. cit. 190 f. There will be found the references that we omit here.
¹⁰² F. Münzer, *Röm. Adelspart.* 155 f.
¹⁰³ E. Bickel, *Philol.* 79, 356 f.
¹⁰⁴ R. Harder, *Ocellus Lucanus* 149 f.
¹⁰⁵ H. Graillot, *Le culte de Cybèle* 38 f.
¹⁰⁶ On the remains, cp. A. Boethius, *Gnomon* 8, 239 f.
¹⁰⁷ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 64.
¹⁰⁸ H. Graillot, op. cit. 41 f.; H. Diels, *Sibyllin. Blätt.* 94, 101 f.; E. Norden, op. cit. 321; E. Kornemann, *Gnomon* 9, 286. That the same idea was already at work at the reception of Venus Erycina has been shown by L. Malten, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 29, 58.
¹⁰⁹ Only from the time of Claudius was the *archigallus* a citizen and, therefore, not a eunuch; cp. J. Carcopino, *Mélanges d'arch. et d'hist.* 1923, 154 f., 237 f.; G. Calza, *Historia* 6, 221 f.
¹¹⁰ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 64, 318; H. Graillot, op. cit. 90.
¹¹¹ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 456 n. 2; H. Graillot, op. cit. 88 f.
¹¹² Op. cit. 195.
¹¹³ *Hellenist. Mysterienrelig.*³ 101 f., 252; cp. also U. v. Wilamowitz, *Plato* 2, 85 n. 1.
¹¹⁴ U. v. Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 34, 634 f.; O. Immisch, *Aus Roms Zeitwende* 16 f.
¹¹⁵ W. Schubart, *Amtl. Berichte a. d. Kunstsamml.* 37, 189 f.; *BGU*, 1211; W. Schubart, *Einf. i. d. Papyruskunde* 352.
¹¹⁶ R. Reitzenstein, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 19, 191 f.; U. Wilcken, *Arch. f. Papyruswiss.* 6, 413 f.; U. v. Wilamowitz, *Plato* 2, 85. On the view of Cichorius (*Röm. Stud.* 21 f.), according to which it was M. Aemilius Lepidus, who lived from 201 onwards in Alexandria as guardian of the children of Philopator, who in Rome as pontifex maximus put into effect the regulations that had already been tested in Egypt, see A. D. Nock, *Class. Rev.* 38, 105 f.; W. Kroll, *Neue Jahrb.* 4, 530; E. Fraenkel, *Hermes* 67, 386 n. 1. Cp. also M. Ros-tovtzeff, *Mystic Italy* 86 f., 112; U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 2, 377; H. Herter, *De Priapo* 20 n. 1; W. Schubart, *Der Alte Orient* 35, 2, 10 n. 1; H. Heichelheim, *Bursians Jahresber.* 250, 253; W. W. Tarn, *Hellenist. civl.*² 803.
¹¹⁷ F. Cumont, op. cit. 74.
¹¹⁸ W. W. Tarn, op. cit. 310 f.
¹¹⁹ R. Reitzenstein, *Hellenist. Mysterienrelig.*² 104 f.
¹²⁰ G. Misch, *Gesch. d. Autobiographie* 1, 139 f.
¹²¹ Cp. G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 89 n. 2.
¹²² H. Graillot, op. cit. 95 f.

- ¹²³ H. Graillot, *op. cit.* 98 f.
¹²⁴ H. Graillot, *op. cit.* 100 ; F. Cumont, *op. cit.* 51.
¹²⁵ *Op. cit.* 212.
¹²⁶ Cp. F. Cumont, *op. cit.* 220 n. 50.
¹²⁷ R. Reitzenstein, *op. cit.* 103 n. 2.
¹²⁸ M. Rostovtzeff, *Mystic Italy* 47, 138.
¹²⁹ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*³ 217 n. 1.
¹³⁰ *Op. cit.* 192.
¹³¹ *Op. cit.* 101 f., 116 f. ; cp. Dio Cassius 52, 36, 2, and E. Fraenkel, *op. cit.* 871 f.
¹³² R. Reitzenstein, *op. cit.* 116 ; cp. also U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 2, 478.

BOOK IV

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

¹ Fundamental principles in F. Messerschmidt, *Röm. Mitt.* 46, 74 f. On frescoes from the cemetery of Tarquinii, now lost, Cybele was represented on the chariot of lions. This calls to mind the cult of Magna Mater in Rome, and certainly that cult supplied the model for the city of southern Etruria (F. Messerschmidt, *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* 5, 81).

² For pictorial art, cp. A. Rumpf, *Einl. i. d. Altertumswiss.* 2, 3, 82 f.

³ F. Leo, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* 1, 153.

⁴ K. Meister, *Indug. Forsch.* 26, 69 f.

⁵ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 294 n. 4.

⁶ J. Hatzfeld, *Bull. Corr. Hell.* 1912, 153 f.; M. Bulard, *Monum. Piot* 14, 18 f.; cp. also *Explor. archéol. de Délos* IX.

⁷ Not only the goddess Roma herself, but actually *Roma aeterna*, already appears in Republican times. R. Reitzenstein (*Iran. Erlösungsmyst.* 210 f.) has already pointed out some evidence for the belief in the eternity of the city. Earlier than any of his evidence is the Hymn of Melinno to Rome (Joh. Stob. 1, p. 312 H.; on it, cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, *Timotheos Perser* 71 n. 1; E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* 160), where we read: πάντα δὲ σφάλλον ὁ μέγιστος Αἰών . . . σοι μόνα πηλασίῳ σθρον ἀρχᾶς οὐ μεταβάλλει. Here, again, the first step is taken by the provincials; there is nothing to suggest Alexandria, or Iran either. On the type of Roma, cp. J. W. Crous, *Corolla L. Curtius* 217 f.

⁸ O. Regenbogen, *Gnomon* 3, 234, 238; *Lukrez* 14.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

¹ U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 2, 223 f.

² Cp. now O. Regenbogen, *Lukrez* 8, to whose description of the age we may refer.

³ For the Roman, *superstitio* is something fundamentally distinct from true *religio*. Originally it denoted nothing else than a state of ecstasy; cp. W. F. Otto, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 12, 551 f.

⁴ *Wirtschaft u. Gesellschaft* 1², 277 f.

⁵ F. Münzer, *Röm. Adelspart.* 410, 414 f.

⁶ F. Münzer, op. cit. 859 f.; G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 70; Th. Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsr.* 2², 28 f.

⁷ Marquardt-Wissowa, *Staatsverwaltung* 8², 286 f.

⁸ O. Regenbogen, *Lukrez* 9.

⁹ F. Leo, op. cit. 1, 322.

¹⁰ We cannot enter here into the divergent interpretation of the verses (which are really decisive in themselves) in P. Friedländer, *Hermes* 67, 43 f., and O. Regenbogen, op. cit. 71 f., as that would require a close investigation. We will only add one short comment on the prologue to the whole work, that so far seems to have escaped notice.

Again and again we can establish in Lucretius how strongly the traditional forms of religious language have influenced his diction—we can even see how he deliberately has recourse to them to lend additional expressiveness and dignity to his words; in one single case the influence of religious art can be detected. The description in 1, 33 f., is to be understood in the sense that Mars leans back on the bosom of the goddess (*reticit*); looking up to her from below (*suspiciens*), he turns his gaze on her with bowed head (*tereti cervice reposita*; *resupinus*); Venus must, then, be conceived as sitting beside him. The structure of this group reminds us of another from the sculptor's art, the group of Dionysus and Ariadne. It meets us on the frescoes of the Hall of the Mysteries of the Villa Igem and also on works of minor art; the work, then, was an important one (M. Bieber, *Arch. Jahrb.* 1928, 301; L. Curtius, *D. Wandmal. Pompeis* 889).

¹¹ E. Tabeling, *Mater Larum* 19 f., 68 f.

¹² K. Reinhardt, *Poseidonios* 408 f.

¹³ F. Leo, op. cit. 1, 348 f.; but cp. also J. Stroux, *Summum ius* 35 f.

¹⁴ H. Dahlmann, *Varro u. d. hellenist. Sprachphilosophie* 49 f.

¹⁵ We need not here take account of such isolated predecessors as Valerius Soranus (F. Leo, op. cit. 1, 432; O. Regenbogen, op. cit. 65).

¹⁶ G. Wissowa, *Gesamm. Abh.* 308 f.; *RuKdR*² 72 n. 1; *Hermes* 56, 113 f.

¹⁷ *De L. l.* 5, 57–74, may serve as an example; on the sources of the section, see H. Dahlmann, op. cit. 20 f.

¹⁸ H. Dahlmann, op. cit. 26 f., 43 f., 50 f.

¹⁹ H. Knoche, *Der Philosoph Seneca* 20 and note.

²⁰ G. Rohde, *Die Kultsätze der Pontifices* 174.

²¹ More evidence will be found collected in W. Kroll, *Neue Jahrb.* 1928, 527 f.

²² H. Fuchs, *Augustin und der antike Friedensgedanke* 151 f.

²³ Out of the plentiful literature on the Fourth Eclogue we need only quote: E. Norden, *Geburt des Kindes*; W. Weber, *Der Prophet und sein Gott*; F. Boll, *Sulla quarta ecloga di Virgilio* (*Memor. commun. il 19. maggio 1923 alle classi di scienze morali della R. Accademia di Bologna*, ser. II, tom. V–VII, 1920–23); F. Pfister, *Burs. Jahresber.* 229, 239. On the divine child: A. Alföldi, *Hermes* 65, 369 f.; L. Deubner, *Gnomon* 1, 167 f.; F. Klingner, *Hermes* 62, 153; *Röm. Mitt.* 45, 50; W. Schadewaldt, *Aus Roms Zeitwende* 79; K. Kerényi, *Klio* 29, f.; W. W. Tarn, *Journ. Rom. stud.* 1932, 135 f. Schadewaldt has above all insisted on the real content of the Eclogue and on the fact that, in Virgil, only the motif as such is Oriental.

²⁴ J. Kroll, *Hermes* 49, 629 f.; 57, 600 f.; F. Klingner, *Hermes* 62, 143 f.; H. Oppermann, *Hermes* 67, 217 f.

²⁵ This observation is equally valid for the world of literature: O. Regenbogen, op. cit. 15.

²⁶ F. Münzer, *Röm. Adelspart.* 88 f.

²⁷ E. Bethe, *Rhein. Mus.* 1892, 577 f.; F. Leo, *Hermes* 1903, 1 f.; G. Jachmann, *Neue Jahrb.* 1922, 115 f.; G. Rohde, *De Vergil. ecl. forma et indole* 25 f.; F. Klingner, *Hermes* 62, 129 f.; W. Wily, *Vergil* 33 f.; H. Oppermann, *Hermes* 67, 212 f. Our space does not permit us to discuss the alternatives in detail.

²⁸ W. Schadewaldt, *Aus Roms Zeitwende* 78.

²⁹ F. Klingner, op. cit. 137.

³⁰ F. Klingner, op. cit. 138, 140.

³¹ F. Klingner himself does not deny this in principle (op. cit. 137; cp. *Röm. Mitt.* 45, 49), but he draws no conclusions from it.

³² F. Klingner, op. cit. 138.

³³ The importance of this may be emphasized by a brief reference to the grouping by numbers that Virgil so carefully observes. On the two groups of five in the beginning follow each time seven verses (11-17, 19-25), which are rounded off by an eighth (18, 26) that ends in a question. This again confirms the inner relation of the two questions to one another. In the sequel the arrangement is that the nine connected verses of Tityrus (27-35) find an exact correspondence of numbers in 36-45. Only the last verse is redundant, like those questions in verses 18 and 26. It contains the pronouncement that finally answers them.

³⁴ On the facts of this connexion, see F. Klingner, op. cit. 139 n. 1.

³⁵ F. Klingner, op. cit. 140 f.

³⁶ This holds good quite independently of the question whether in *Ecl.* 6, 4, Virgil himself is meant by Tityrus or not (F. Leo, op. cit. 3; G. Jachmann, op. cit. 116). It is in any case out of the question that a personal interpretation of our poem should be hinted at.

³⁷ F. Klingner, *Röm. Mitt.* 45, 49; U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 2, 249.

³⁸ W. F. Otto, *Vergil* 14 f.

³⁹ Excellently brought out by W. Wily, op. cit. 34 f. It has long been recognized that the first Eclogue is distinguished from everything that might be regarded as its precursors by the fact that in it for the first time a historical person stands in the centre (G. Jachmann, op. cit. 115 f.; F. Klingner, op. cit. 144 f.; *Röm. Mitt.* 45, 47 f.; H. Oppermann, op. cit. 214 f.). We have no space to enter into the question of such precursors. We must leave it undecided whether the Daphnis Eclogue is really dominated by the idea of the god-man and saviour, or by ideas of a quite different order. We should have to raise the general question, whether the search for a single fundamental form, expressing itself with increasing distinctness in the temporal succession of the Eclogues, helps us by itself to an understanding of the whole collection of Eclogues. In any case, should we not consider, in contrast to this formal method, a simple acceptance of the collection as a series planned by the poet? May not various sides of the world of Virgil have found their expression here, so that our task is not to bring them down to one common denominator by a formal treatment, but to grasp them in their deliberate variety?

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

¹ J. Gagé, *Mél. d'arch. et d'hist.* 53, 86 f.

² Dio 51, 16, 5. The importance of this journey has now been placed in a new light by the so-called *βουλή-ᾠδὴ*-papyrus; cp. *Pap. Gr. e Lat.* X, no. 1160; U. Wilcken, *Arch. f. Papyrussforsch.* 9, 254.

³ Recently, A. Bartoli has claimed to have found not only the Palatine Vesta (justifiable doubts in W. Technau, *Arch. Anz.* 1930, 364), but also the site of the temple of Apollo. In the autumn of 1932 I saw the results of some trial-diggings in the north-east corner of the Palatine, where the temple is usually placed; I can form no sure judgement on the evidence.

⁴ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 76; I cannot, however, think it right, against the evidence of Suetonius (*Aug.* 31, 1) to place the tradition earlier than the year 12 B.C. Dio Cassius 54, 17, 12 (18 B.C.) speaks only of a copying, not of a revision or of a rejection of suspicious portions. On Tibullus 2, 5, 17 f., and Virgil, *Aen.* 6, 72 f., cp. the cautious expressions of F. Leo, *Philol. Unters.* 2, 5, 17 f.; E. Norden in his commentary² 148.

⁵ G. E. Rizzo, *Boll. Comm.* 1933, 71 f., fig. 11 f.

⁶ A. Kiessling, *Philol. Unters.* 2, 92 n. 36.

⁷ O. Immisch, *Aus Roms Zeitwende* 31 f.

⁸ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 42, 293, 536; *GG.* 162 f.

⁹ L. Malten, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 29, 37.

¹⁰ A. Maiuri, *Historia* 4, 82.

¹¹ Of this a visit to the place itself must convince every unprejudiced person (information from K. Kerényi).

¹² L. Malten, op. cit. 37.

¹³ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 298.

¹⁴ I owe this reference to W. F. Otto; cp. also *RE.* 8, 1934; R. v. Kienle, *Wörter und Sachen* 14, 32 f.

¹⁵ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 296 n. 2.

¹⁶ Evidence in G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 294 f.

¹⁷ The addition, *ut plerique rentur*, shows that Livy had before him a divergent view; see G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 295.

¹⁸ As lord of pestilence, Apollo appears among the Etruscans in the story, Herod. 1, 167, but also as god of healing; *GG.* 164. On Apollo and the Samnites: cp. Festus p. 158 M. and C. Cichorius, *Röm. Stud.* 58 f.

¹⁹ Th. Mommsen, *Ephem. epigr.* 8, 225 f.; *Reden u. Aufsätze* 351 f.; G. Wissowa, *Gesamm. Abhandl.* 192 f.

²⁰ J. Vahlen, *Gesamm. Schrift.* 2, 369 f.

²¹ On the date, cp. E. Diehl, *Rhein. Mus.* 83, 349 f.

²² Cicero, *de nat. deor.* 2, 72; Gellius 4, 91; cp. W. F. Otto, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 12, 587 f., 540.

²³ These are the two sides of the idea that are rendered in Greek by the words *εὐλαβία* and *θρησκεία*, as K. Kerényi has pointed out (*Byzant.-Neugriech. Jahrb.* 1931, 306 f.).

²⁴ The gist of thought in Livy amounts to this, that all *religio* is linked to the soil of the city of Rome. Here stood the temples of the gods, here the priests had their seat, here were stored the sacred objects with which the endurance of Rome was indissolubly connected.

Once again it is a contemporary event that is reflected in the historical. It is remarkable that in Horace, too, only a few poems before, in the third Roman Ode, the note of a transference of the site of Rome is sounded. Only now the new site is not Veii, but Ilion, to which, in the general view, Caesar thought of transferring the capital of the Empire (Suet., *Caesar* 79, 8; Nik. Dam., v. *Caes.* 20). Here, again, sounds from the lips of Juno the warning not to remove the sea that sunders Rome and Ilion or to rebuild the waste site. This agreement with Livy is as little accidental as that which we have just mentioned; I still think, despite the scepticism of Heinze (*Komm.*⁷ 262), that it represents an actual fact.

²⁵ Th. Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsr.*³ 3, 567 f.

²⁶ G. E. Rizzo, op. cit. 25 f.

²⁷ On the excavations that have been undertaken there, cp. R. Horn, *Gnomon* 8, 324 f.; O. Brendel, *Arch. Anz.* 1933, 615 f.

²⁸ G. Rodenwaldt, *Gnomon* 2, 339.

²⁹ W. Kolbe, *Aus Roms Zeitwende* 55 f.

³⁰ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*¹ 78.

³¹ *Aus Roms Zeitwende* 3 f.

³² O. Immisch, op. cit. 29.

³³ See also U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 2, 262 f.

³⁴ E. Dieckermann, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 27, 24 f.

³⁵ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*¹ 78; Ed. Meyer, *Caesars Monarchie*³ 508 f.

³⁶ L. Wenger, *Zeitschr. d. Savigny-Stiftg., R.A.* 49, 320 f.

³⁷ U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 2, 429.

³⁸ To this can now be added the evidence of the copy of Antioch: Ramsay-Premmerstein, *Klio Beih.* 19, 68.

³⁹ U. v. Wilamowitz, *Vortr. Warburg* 1925-26, 157 n. 6; *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 2, 328 n. 2.

⁴⁰ It was said to have been linked with a right of asylum (Dio Cassius 54, 25, 3), which is of fundamental importance for the question of the existence of such a right in Rome.

⁴¹ Not correct V. Ehrenberg, *Klio* 19, 208.

⁴² See R. Heinze on v. 81.

⁴³ R. Heinze on v. 25.

⁴⁴ Th. Mommsen, *Gesamm. Schrift.* 7, 181.

⁴⁵ W. F. Otto, *Die Manen* 59 f.

⁴⁶ On the following cp. Th. Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht*³ 2, 772 n. 1; W. F. Otto, *Thes. l. l.* 2, 1379 f.; V. Ehrenberg, *Klio* 19, 207 f.

⁴⁷ Th. Mommsen, *CIL*. I, 1², commentary on January 17; J. Gagé, *Rev. Arch.* 1931, II, 14 f.

⁴⁸ R. Heinze on vv. 42 and 44.

⁴⁹ K. Scott, *Hermes* 63, 27 f.; R. Heinze in *Carm.* I, 2, 41 f.; O. Immisch, op. cit. 26 f. Egyptian origin in this case seems to me as unlikely as possible, even if conceptions of that land may have been subsequently associated with the person of the Emperor. Such an assumption contradicts not only the attitude of Horace so soon after the decisive battle, but also that of the Emperor (cp. Dio Cassius 53, 2, 4). Strangely enough, it has not yet been remarked that Mercury, as bringer of peace, belongs to the older Roman religion. In the temple of Concordia his image stood beside that of the goddess herself; the caduceus counted as a symbol of peace, and the ambassadors, who were entrusted with the ending of a war, took their

name from it. Cp. *GG.* 76 and L. Deubner, *Röm. Mitt.* 45, 39 f.; we must now add Livy 8, 20, 6, and the denarii of the *gens Fufia* and *Mucia* (Babelon I, pp. 512-13; II, pp. 236-7), on the reverse of which *Ital(ia)* and *Roma* appear; above them is the caduceus as sign of peace with the allies. We may at least refer to the caduceus dealt with by H. Krahe, *Indog. Forsch.* 49, 267 f.

⁵⁰ K. Lehmann-Hartleben, *Röm. Mitt.* 42, 163 f., 173 f.

⁵¹ A. Furtwängler, *Ant. Gemmen* pl. XXXVIII, 30; K. Lehmann-Hartleben, op. cit. 174, fig. 83.

⁵² O. Immisch, op. cit. 27 n. 1; K. Scott, *Röm. Mitt.* 50, 225 f.

⁵³ Cp. also the dedication of the Coan *scrutari* (K. Scott, op. cit. 31 f.; O. Immisch, op. cit. 27) and O. Brendel, *Röm. Mitt.* 50, 231 f.

⁵⁴ H. Heinen, *Klio* 1911, 140 n. 8; E. Bickermann, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 27, 25 n. 1; O. Immisch, op. cit. 28; K. Scott, *Mem. Amer. Acad. Rome* 11, 80 f.

⁵⁵ K. Sauer, *Unters. z. Gesch. d. Todes* (Diss. Frankf. 1930), 61; O. Immisch, op. cit. 21.

⁵⁶ M. Rostovtzeff, *Röm. Mitt.* 1923/24, 298 f.; J. Sieveking, *Gnomon* 7, 20 f.; O. Immisch, op. cit. 34; *Horazens Epistel über d. Dichtkunst* 204; L. Poinssot, *Notes et documents* 10, pl. 7.

⁵⁷ Ed. Meyer, *Kl. Schrift.* 2, 436 f.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

¹ At this point we may refer to what M. Rostovtzeff has to say in *Röm. Mitt.* 38/39, 281 f.; *Wirtschaft u. Gesellsch. i. d. röm. Kaiserzeit* 1, 39 f., 253 f. Among the productions of the anniversary of Virgil we would signalize W. Wily's *Vergil* and, above all, the lecture of W. F. Otto (*Schrift. d. Strassb. Wiss. Gesellsch., N.F.* 19, 1931).

² R. Heinze, *D. august. Kultur* 54. That Horace does actually announce a change from his former Epicurean convictions is plain from a comparison with *Sat.* 1, 5, 101 f.—despite the attempt of U. v. Wilamowitz to deny it. But to say that Horace turned to the Stoic theology (R. Heinze, op. cit. 53 f., and in his commentary) seems to me just as bold as to maintain that, at bottom, 'he did not believe in the existence of the gods of Greece and Rome' (Wilamowitz). V. 3, *nunc retrorsum vela dare atque iterare cursus cogor relictos*, admits of no other meaning than a return to the belief of yore. With this agrees the view in which Fortune is not the capricious and mischievous goddess, but, like a *ρόχη* or *μοῖρα* *Διός*, obeys the command of Jupiter (v. 14 f.; cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 2, 438 n. 1). In the Ode to Fortune that follows, to which our poem forms the prelude, the later Fortuna Redux of the state-cult (H. Heinze, in his commentary) is anticipated; cp. the prayers of the Arval Brethren in W. Henzen, *Acta fratrum Arval.* 86, 122, 124.

³ H. Heinze, *Die augusteische Kultur* 48 f.

⁴ U. Knoche, *Der Philosoph Seneca* (1938).

⁵ The identification of Stoic and Roman was not completed before Seneca: U. Knoche, op. cit. 23 f.

⁶ W. F. Otto, op. cit. 14 f., 17.

⁷ W. Wily, op. cit. 98 f.; R. Heinze, *Hermes* 65, 390.

⁸ *Pius*, *pietas*, are certainly not used originally in the meaning of obligation towards men: Naevius, *bell. Poenic.* fr. 12 Morel; Ennius,

sc. 830 V. Such old forms as *piaculum* and *impius* show that the gods were included in their scope. Thus the assumption of a later extension of the conception under the influence of *εὐσέβεια* (K. Meister, *Die Tugenden d. Römer* 17 f.) seems to fall to the ground.

⁹ R. Herbig, *Antike* 7, 135 f.

¹⁰ Even the catholic spirit of a M. Weber is no exception to the general rule.

¹¹ The two appear side by side in Suetonius, *Augustus* 89, 2.

¹² *Mon. Anc.* 2, 12 f.; see also Th. Mommsen, *Res gestae*² 40 (*iam* is certainly to be taken with *evolescentia*) and Ramsay-Premierstein, *Kho Beih.* 19, 63 f.

¹³ F. Solmsen, *Zeitschr. f. Ästhet.* 26, 158.

¹⁴ F. Solmsen, *op. cit.* 158.

¹⁵ So the recorded text of c. 4, 3, 15, which even F. Solmsen, *op. cit.* 160, tries to keep. Heinze's recommendation of Bücheler's conjecture *vatem* does not seem to me cogent, for *dignatur* does not imply condescension, but, above all, that some one is regarded as worthy of honour. The *vatum chori*, it is true, have nothing to correspond to them but the *Musarum chori*—and perhaps this is intentional, as the position of the *vates* in the divine world, which we have still to discuss, will show. In any case I regard it as decisive that Horace attached value to the judgement of the youth of Rome.

¹⁶ F. Klingner, *Röm. Mitt.* 45, 51 f.; J. Stroux, *Vergil* 9.

¹⁷ F. Klingner, *op. cit.* 51.

¹⁸ Th. Mommsen, *Res gestae*² 86.

¹⁹ R. Heinze⁷ on v. 2.

²⁰ R. Heinze⁷ 288 f.

²¹ R. Heinze⁷ 248 f.

²² *CIL.* I², 1, p. 186 f.

²³ E. Fraenkel, *Plautin. im Plautus* 107 f.

²⁴ K. Sauer, *Unters. z. Darstellung d. Todes* (Frankf. Diss. 1930); W. Schulze, *KL Schrift.* 138 f.

²⁵ G. Rodenwaldt, *Arch. Anz.* 1923/24, 366 f.

²⁶ F. Wickhoff, *Röm. Kunst* 123 f., 168 f.; K. Lehmann-Hartleben, *Die Trajanssäule*; M. Wegner, *Arch. Jahrb.* 1931, 61 f.

²⁷ E. Norden, *Aeneis Buch VI*², 315.

²⁸ E. Norden, *op. cit.* 315.

²⁹ E. Fraenkel in *Das Problem d. Klassischen i. d. Antike* 64.

³⁰ More on this point will be found in E. Fraenkel, *Plautin. im Plautus* 237 f., and O. Regenbogen, *Lukrez* 54. The indignant questions of Augustus in Seneca, *Apocol.* 10, where the fine ear of Bücheler caught the echo of Virgil, *Aeneid* 6, 810, employ the style of the *elogium*.

³¹ H. Mattingly, *Class. Rev.* 48, 161 f.; cp. H. A. Cahn, *Rev. Suisse de numismat.* 1935, 11; E. Diehl, *Rhein. Mus.* 83, 349.

³² W. F. Otto, *RE.* 6, 2058.

³³ W. F. Otto, *RE.* 6, 2059 f., 2071; cp. B. Rehm, *Philol. Suppl.* 24, 2, 76.

³⁴ W. F. Otto, *Vergil* 17.

³⁵ W. F. Otto, *RE.* 6, 2059 f.; G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 211. On a divine being called *fatus*, see now F. Messerschmidt, *Arch. für Religionswiss.* 29, 67.

³⁶ F. Sgobbi, *Nsc.* 1930, 410 f.

³⁷ Thus probably interpreted by G. Devoto, *GLi antichi Italici* 251 f.; another explanation in St. Weinstock, *Röm. Mitt.* 47, 116 f.; a criticism of his view would involve one of his whole discussion, Cp. A. v. Blumenthal, *Klio* 27, 1 f.

³⁸ E. Schwyzer, *Rhein. Mus.* 84, 116.

³⁹ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 55; W. F. Otto, *Rhein. Mus.* 64, 459.

⁴⁰ It has been observed that, in c. 3, 4, 5 f., the poet, unlike a real Dionysiac, ἐξεστηκώς, is still quite conscious of himself, and that the trance cannot therefore be a reality. Against this we might remark that the *θεία μανία* as the gift of the Muses should, in its innermost nature, be something distinct from the Bacchic madness, and a comparison of the two poems actually brings out the contrast sharply enough.

⁴¹ F. Solmsen, op. cit. 180.

⁴² For me at least this is decisive (in contrast to what U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 2, 437, says) for the interpretation of 2, 19 as well.

⁴³ On W. Theyler's idea of a 'theory of the Muses' held by Horace (*Schrift. d. Königsberger Gelehr. Gesellsch.* 12, 4), cp. F. Klingner, *Gnomon* 18, 36 f.

⁴⁴ According to Pindar, *Pyth.* 5, 65, Apollo gives the Muse and with her ἀπόλεμος εὐνοία to every man; cp. U. v. Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* 382.

⁴⁵ R. Heinze on v. 41.

⁴⁶ R. Heinze in his commentary⁷ 271.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

¹ *Act. lud. saec.* 10; *Sibyll.* 29 δαίμοσι μελιχίοισι and Th. Mommsen, *Ephem. epigr.* 8, 258.

² R. Heinze in v. 9.

³ H. Usener, *Götternam.*² 258 f.; F. Boll, *Die Sonne im Glauben und in der Weltanschauung der alten Völker* 17.

⁴ The expression has its model in the letter of Augustus: 1. 20 *pueros virginesque patrimos matrim[osque ad carmen can]endum choro[rum]que habendos frequentes u[el] adsint[.]*

⁵ Th. Mommsen, op. cit. 255 f.

⁶ Quoted by I. Vahlen, *Gesamm. philol. Schriften* 2, 375.

⁷ H. Diels, *Sibyllin. Blätter* 14 f.; R. Heinze in his commentary⁷ 480; Nilsson, *RE.* 1A, 1712; W. Weber, *Der Prophet und sein Gott* 91 n. 2.

⁸ *diem qui . . . celas* 9 f. ~ ἡέλλου κρήνηντος ἑὸν φάος 7.

⁹ G. Pasquali, *Orazio lirico* 736 n. 2.

¹⁰ R. Heinze on v. 1 and 9.

¹¹ F. Boll, op. cit. 18.

¹² G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 297.

¹³ Cp. E. Strong, *Scultura Romana* 2, 184, fig. 108.

¹⁴ Aleman, fr. 43 D., describes Herse, who brings the dew by night, as daughter of Selene. There again the goddess of dew is associated with the Moon.

¹⁵ *date* 8 ~ *possis* 11.

¹⁶ *tuere* 14; *producas* . . . *prosperes* 17 f.; *iungite* 28; *donet* 30; *audi* . . . *audi* 84 f.

¹⁷ F. Boll, op. cit. 8 f.; R. Heinze in his commentary.

¹⁸ W. F. Otto, *Die Götter Griechenlands* 102; *Orph. hymn.* 84, 16 f.; Skythinos (Diels, *Poet. philos.* fr. p. 169), fr. 1. Cp. also O. Weinreich, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 19, 181; O. Gruppe, *Griech. Mythol.* 1241 n. 2; R. Reitzenstein, *Psimandres* 280 f.; E. Neustadt, *Hermes* 66, 389.

¹⁹ R. Reitzenstein, op. cit. 282 f.; O. Weinreich, *Senecas Apocol.* 44 f.

²⁰ H. Usener, *Götternamen*³ 178.

²¹ R. Heinze in vv. 37-8; *August. Kultur* 54; *Vergils epische Technik* 291 n. 1.

²² Th. Mommsen, *Reden und Aufsätze* 357.

²³ J. Vahlen, op. cit. 385.

²⁴ R. Heinze on vv. 37-48.

²⁵ W. F. Otto, *Die altgriech. Gottesidee* 17 f.; *Die Götter Griechenlands* 151 f.

²⁶ U. v. Wilamowitz, *Griech. Tragöd.* 2, 218.

²⁷ W. F. Otto, op. cit. 37 f.; H. Fraenkel, *Festschrift Reitzenstein* 7 n. 3.

²⁸ Author, *TM.* 4 f.

²⁹ E. Fraenkel in *Das Problem des Klassischen in der Antike* 66 f.

³⁰ E. Fraenkel, op. cit. 59.

³¹ E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* 151 n. 4.

³² J. Vahlen, op. cit. 2, 381.

³³ R. Heinze on v. 45; K. Meister, op. cit. 22.

³⁴ *Alma Ceres* or *alma Tellus*, cp. Ovid. *Met.* 2, 272. On the sun as giver of all blessings, read the fine words of Usener.

³⁵ U. v. Wilamowitz, *Hellenist. Dichtung* 2, 289; author, *TM.* 131 f.

³⁶ R. Heinze, *D. august. Kultur* 57.

BOOK V

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

- ¹ *Leipziger Rektoratsrede* 1921, 3. edition, 1980.
- ² J. Vogt, *Röm. Geschichte*, 1. Hälfte : *Die röm. Republik* 44.
- ³ J. Vogt, op. cit. 45.
- ⁴ J. Vogt, op. cit. 45.
- ⁵ H. Siber, *Abh. Sächs. Akad., phil.-hist. Kl.* 43, 3, 24.
- ⁶ E. Norden, *Vergil. Aen. VI*² 338, v. 851; R. Heinze, *Horat. carm.* 3, 6, 2; *sat.* 1, 4, 85.
- ⁷ H. Diels, *Sibyll. Blätter* 133 f.
- ⁸ W. F. Otto, *Vergil* 17.
- ⁹ G. Björck, *Symb. Osl.* 15-16, 89 n. 1.
- ¹⁰ G. Björck, op. cit.; W. F. Otto, *RE.* 6, 2047 f.
- ¹¹ R. Heinze, *Horat. carm.* 3, 6, 2.
- ¹² W. F. Otto, *Vergil* 17.
- ¹³ G. Rohde, *Die Bedeutung d. Tempelgründungen im Staatsleben d. Römer.*
- ¹⁴ J. Vogt, op. cit. 46 f.
- ¹⁵ J. Vogt, op. cit. 51.
- ¹⁶ G. Rohde, *Die Kultsatzungen der Pontifices* 135 n. 6; Author, *TM.* 80 f.
- ¹⁷ E. Fraenkel, *Neue Jahrb.* 1932, 219.
- ¹⁸ J. Gagé, *Mél. d'arch. et d'hist.* 53, 56; cp. 75 f.
- ¹⁹ J. Carcopino, *Sylla ou la monarchie manquée* 107 f., 109 n. 2.
- ²⁰ *Thes. l. lat.* 6, 435 z., 72 f.; 437 z. 44 f.; 439 z. 54 f.; 442 z. 84 f.; 446 z. 20 f. (Ammann).
- ²¹ Author, *Epochen* II, 65 f.
- ²² R. Heinze, *Rektoratsrede* 22.
- ²³ *Vorles. über die Philos. d. Weltgesch.* 3, 708 f. (Lasson).
- ²⁴ Op. cit. 3, 665 f.
- ²⁵ J. Vogt, *Gnomon* 12, 520.
- ²⁶ M. Gelzer, *Philol.* 86, 292.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

- ¹ *Das Weihnachtsfest*³ p. ix.
- ² A short survey in W. Weber, *Antike* 1, 111 f. Of general literature, we may adduce Sir Aurel Stein, *Ancient Chotan I-II* (1907); *Ruins of Desert Cathay I-II* (1912); *Serindia I-V* (1921); *Innermost Asia I-IV* (1928); *On Alexander's Track to the Indus* (1929); A. Grünwedel, *Alt buddhist. Kultstätten* (1912); A. v. Le Coq, *Chotscho* (1913); *Buddhist. Spätantike in Mittelasien I-IV* (1922 24); *Bilderatlas zur Kunst- und Kulturgesch. Mittelasiens* (1925); *Von Land und Leuten in Ostturkestan* (1928).

² F. W. K. Müller, *Handschriftenreste in Estrangeloschrift*, Abhandl. Berl. Akad. 1904; E. Waldschmidt und W. Lentz, *D. Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus*, Abhandl. Berl. Akad. 1926.

⁴ H. H. Schaeder, *Stud. Warburg* 7, 240 f.; *Vorträge Warburg* 1924-25, 65 f.; *Antike* 4, 226 f., 249 f.

⁵ M. Lidzbarski, *D. Johannesbuch d. Mandäer I-II*, 1915; *Mandäische Liturgien* (1920); R. Reitzenstein, *D. mand. Buch. d. Herrn der Grösse u. die Evangelienüberlief.* (1919).

⁶ R. Reitzenstein, *D. Vorges. d. christl. Taufe* (1929); cp. H. H. Schaeder, *Gnomon* 5, 358 f.; a reply by R. Reitzenstein in *Arch. f. Religionswiss.* 27, 241 f.

⁷ We have to think in the first place of the research of J. Strzygowski, to whom the phrase that we have quoted is due: *Beit. z. Allg. Zeitung* 140-141, 18-19, 2. 1902. Cp. also *Mschatta*, *Jahrb. d. preuss. Kunstsg.* 25, 425 f.; *Amida* (1910); *Altai-Iran und die Völkerwanderung* (1917); *D. Baukunst d. Armenier und Europa I-II*.

⁸ We may mention F. Cumont, *Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra I II* (1899, 1896); *Les mystères de Mithra*; *Les religions orientales*; *After-life in Roman Paganism* (1922); R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* (1904); *Hellenist. Wundererzählungen* (1906); *Die hellenist. Mysterienrelig.* (1927); *D. iran. Erlösungsmyst.* (1921); *Stud. z. antlk. Synkret.* (*Stud. Warburg* 7).

⁹ *Röm. Mitt.* 49, 1 f.; 50, 1 f.

¹⁰ Some remarks on ruler-cult, especially in Rome, *Harvard Theolog. Review* 28, 5 f.

¹¹ Cp. O. Weinreich, *Senecas Apocol.* 46 f.; S. Eitrem, *Symb. OsI.* 15-16, 118.

¹² G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 81.

¹³ M. P. Charlesworth, *Providentia and Aeternitas*, *Harvard Theolog. Review* 29, 107 f.

¹⁴ A. v. Domaszewski, *Oesterr. Jahresh.* 2, 176 f.; *Abh. z. röm. Religion* 28 f.; F. Noack, *Vortr. Warburg* 1925-26, 198. On the date of this relief, which probably belongs to the age of Hadrian, see G. A. S. Snijder, *Arch. Jahrb.* 1926, 122 f.

¹⁵ A. Alföldi, *Röm. Mitt.* 50, 95 f.

¹⁶ E. Aust in Roscher, *Mythol. Lex.* 2, 749 f.; F. Toutain, *Les cultes païens dans l'empire Romain* I, 1, 181 f.; G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 83.

¹⁷ W. Henzen, *Acta frat. Arval.*; *CIL.* 6, 2023 f.; 32338 f.; *Nsc.* 1914, 470 f.

¹⁸ *RuKdR*² 82. We may add the description of Th. Mommsen, *Reden u. Aufsätze* 286 f.; G. Rohde, op. cit. 43.

¹⁹ Of fundamental importance for the use of coin-types on the historical side are the studies of A. Alföldi (25 *Jahre röm.-german. Kommiss.* 11 f.; *Hermes* 65, 869 f.; *Journ. Rom. stud.* 1932, 9 f.) and the well-known works and studies of H. Mattingly. The material for the personifications of the imperial cult will be found in W. Koehler, *Personifikat. abstrakter Begriffe auf röm. Münzen* (*Königsb. Diss.* 1910).

²⁰ A. Alföldi, *Röm. Mitt.* 50, 25 f.

²¹ A. Alföldi, *Röm. Mitt.* 49, 98 f.

²² *Röm. Mitt.* 49, 79 f.; cp. J. Gagé, *Byzantion* 11, 334.

²³ A. Alföldi, op. cit. 84.

²⁴ W. Henzen, op. cit. XLIV; cp. also Th. Mommsen, op. cit. 278 f.

²⁵ E. Diehl, *SBBA*. 1932, 775, 790.

²⁶ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 84 n. 2.

²⁷ W. Schadewaldt, *Antike* 6, 270, whose conclusions have in general been adopted here.

²⁸ Sueton., *Tib.* 26; Th. Mommsen, *Gesamm. Schrift.* 4, 269.

²⁹ E. Kornemann, *Neue Dokumente z. laton. Kaiserkult* (1929); L. Wenger, *Zeitschr. d. Savigny-Stiftg., R.A.* 49, 308 f.; K. Stadel, *Gnomon* 8, 195 f.; S. Eitrem, *Symb. Osloenses* 15/16 134; H. Heichelheim, *Gnomon* 10, 397.

³⁰ H. I. Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt* 24, col. 3, 48 f.

³¹ Th. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*³ 2, 756; G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 842 f.

³² O. Weinreich, op. cit. 105 f.

³³ U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 2, 484 f.; occasional exceptions do not invalidate the rule.

³⁴ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 88.

³⁵ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 89.

³⁶ R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenist. Mysterienrelig.*² 99 f.

³⁷ R. Reitzenstein, op. cit. 101.

³⁸ R. Reitzenstein, op. cit. 109 n. 3.

³⁹ O. Brendel, *Gli studi sul rilievo storico Romano (Gli studi Romani nel mondo III)*.

⁴⁰ E. Strong, *La scultura Romana* 72, fig. 46-47; 83, fig. 55; 107, fig. 71-72 (cp. also F. Wickhoff, *Röm. Kunst* 86 f., 115 f., 121 f.); pl. XXV, XLI; 254, fig. 162, 294 f., fig. 179-80.

⁴¹ E. Strong, op. cit. pl. XXXVIII (cp. G. A. S. Snijder, *Arch. Jahrb.* 1926, 122 f.), 193 fig., pl. CX; 210, fig. 122 (cp. G. A. S. Snijder, op. cit. 108 f., against J. Sieveking, *Festschrift P. Arndt* 33).

⁴² E. Strong, op. cit. 95, fig. 85; 131, fig. 84; pl. XXXIX.

⁴³ E. Strong, op. cit. 86, fig. 58; 115, fig. 74; 214, fig. 126; 240, fig. 151. See also E. Strong, *Apotheosis and After-life*.

⁴⁴ O. Brendel, *Röm. Mitt.* 45, 196 f.

⁴⁵ At the turn of the second to third century this great style in plastic representation quickly dies away. Only under the Severi does something comparable still show itself, as on the Arch of Septimius Severus or on the effective relief in the Palazzo Sacchetti (E. Strong, op. cit. tav. LXVIII).

⁴⁶ E. Strong, op. cit. pl. XXVI f.

⁴⁷ E. Strong, op. cit. pl. XXXI.

⁴⁸ R. Herbig, *Röm. Mitt.* 40, 289 f.

⁴⁹ E. Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa*³ 1, 240 f.

⁵⁰ G. Rodenwaldt, *Arch. Anz.* 1922, 318 f.

⁵¹ Compare here the description, that still remains classic, of F. Wickhoff, op. cit. 54 f., 86 f., 113 f.

⁵² The head with the features of Nero was replaced by Vespasian by one with the features of Sol. About it and its further fortunes, cp. Hülsen, *RE.* 4, 589 f.

⁵³ P. Friedländer, *Johannes von Gaza* 64 f.

⁵⁴ O. Brendel, *Arch. Anz.* 1933, 603 f.

⁵⁵ G. Rodenwaldt, *Gnomon* 2, 338 f.

⁵⁶ The great northern side-apses are not earlier than the age of the Severi as the excavations have shown (G. Q. Giglioli, *Capitolium* 4, 3 f.; C. Ricci, *Capitolium* 5, 543 f.).

⁵⁷ A. Rumpf, *Einl. i. d. Altertumswiss.* II⁴ 3, 99.

- ⁶⁸ G. T. Rivoira, *Architettura Romana* 257 f.
⁶⁹ F. Jacoby, *Πάντας θεοί* (Haller Diss. 1980); U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 2, 344 f.
⁷⁰ A. v. Gerkan, *Gnomon* 5, 278.
⁷¹ M. Siebourg, *Bonn. Jahrb.* 138, 103 f.
⁷² G. Calza, *Nsc.* 1928, 153 f.; U. v. Wilamowitz, *Stud. Ital.* 7, 89 f.
⁷³ Sarchophagus of a archigallus: G. Calza, *Nsc.* 1931, 511 f.; W. Technau, *Arch. Anz.* 1931, 655 f.
⁷⁴ G. Bendinelli, *Mon. Lincei* 28, 289 f.
⁷⁵ H. Lietzmann, *Petrus und Paulus in Rom*² 301 f.
⁷⁶ Furrina: Chr. Hülsen, *Röm. Mitt.* 22, 225 f.; G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 363.
⁷⁷ Diana Nemorensis: *Nsc.* 1931, 303 f.
⁷⁸ M. Wegener, *Arch. Jahrb.* 46, 61 f.
⁷⁹ O. Brendel, *Arch. Anz.* 1935, 549 f.
⁸⁰ *Ant. Denkm.* IV, pl. XXXVIII f.
⁸¹ O. Brendel, op. cit. 556.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

- ¹ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 349, 361, 362.
² G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 89, 355; Platner-Ashby, *Topogr. Dictionary of Ancient Rome* 487; A. Alföldi, *An Isis festival in Rome under the Christian emperors* (Diss. Pannon. II 7) 43 f.
³ Fiechter-Hülsen in F. Toebeilmann, *Röm. Gebäcke* 1, 73 f.
⁴ CIL. 6, 570; IGI. (FGF.) 1024; Serapis on coins of Caracalla: Mattingly-Sydenham, *The Rom. Imp. Coinage* IV, 1, 86 f., 239, 241, 246 f.
⁵ Hülsen-Jordan, *Topogr. d. Stadt. Rom.* 1², 423; R. Lanciani, *Forma Urbis Romae* pl. XVI.
⁶ F. Geffcken, *Hermes* 55, 281; G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 355 n. 6.
⁷ Platner-Ashby, op. cit. 396.
⁸ F. Stroux, *Philol.* 88, 272 f., 279 f.
⁹ F. Schulz, *Prinzip. d. röm. Rechts* 91.
¹⁰ F. Stroux, op. cit. 284.
¹¹ P. Romanelli, *Nsc.* 1931, 313 f.; E. Diehl, *S.B.B.A.* 1932, 762 f.; cp. *Rhein. Mus.* 1934, 255 f., 348 f.; G. Funaioli, *Riv. di filol.* 1933, 211 f.; P. Romanelli, *Riv. di filol.* 1933, 393 f.; Chr. Hülsen, *Rhein. Mus.* 1932, 366 f.
¹² Chr. Hülsen, op. cit. 375 f.; L. R. Taylor, *Amer. Journ. Philol.* 1934, 108 f.
¹³ In opposition to L. R. Taylor, op. cit.; see also E. Diehl, *Rhein. Mus.* 83, 269 f.
¹⁴ Chr. Hülsen, op. cit. 388 f., lin. 44 and 91.
¹⁵ Chr. Hülsen, op. cit. 382.
¹⁶ Chr. Hülsen, op. cit. 370.
¹⁷ Chr. Hülsen, op. cit. 371.
¹⁸ R. Bartoccini, *Africa Italiana* 4, 32 f.
¹⁹ R. Bartoccini, op. cit. 151 f.
²⁰ R. Bartoccini, op. cit. 116 f.
²¹ R. Bartoccini, op. cit. fig. 44, 46, 80 f.
²² The 'Attis' of fig. 51 is quite uncertain (R. Bartoccini, op. cit. 86) and Sol in fig. 65 is not Mithra.

²³ R. Bartoccini, op. cit. figs. 48 and 64; op. pp. 84 and 92.

²⁴ R. Bartoccini, op. cit. fig. 97 (Juno), fig. 100, and p. 132 (Jupiter Capitolinus or Septimius Severus?).

²⁵ Cp. M. Rostovtzeff, *The Excavations of Dura-Europos, 5th Season 1931-32*, 295 f., pl. XXXI, 2; *Comptes-rend. de l'Acad. des inser.* 1933, 812 f.

²⁶ Col. II: . . . K[al. Iunias ob natalem Gn[ei]a[e f]il[i]ae, Cae[s]aris su[ppli]cati[o] genio] C[a]esaris.—Gneia Seia Herennia Salustia Barbia Orbiiana, daughter of Sallustius Macrinus, Alexander Severus's first wife 225-7. Cp. *Hist. Aug., Al. Sev.* 49, 3; 58, 1, and Groebe, *RE.* 2, 2540 f.

²⁷ CIL. I, 1^a, p. 254 f.; Th. Mommsen, *Gesamm. Schr.* 7, 586 f.

²⁸ A. S. Hoey, *Rosaliae signorum*, *Harvard Theol. Stud.* 30, 15 f.

²⁹ H. Dessau, *Hermes* 27, 567; J. Geffcken, *Hermes* 55, 298; E. Hohl, *Hermes* 55, 301; A. Alföldi, op. cit. 41 n. 104.

³⁰ F. Cumont, *Fouilles de Doura-Europos* 102 f., 129 f.

³¹ Cp. G. Rohde, op. cit. 66.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

¹ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 367 f.; II. Usener, *Rhein. Mus.* 40 f. 467 f. = *Weihnachtsfest*² 351 f.

² F. Cumont, *Die oriental. Relig.*³ 105, 113; Marbach, *RE.* 5A, 908.

³ G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 363, 365 n. 4.

⁴ C. Koch, *Gestirne erchrung im alten Italien* (Frankf. Stud. 3).

⁵ C. Koch, op. cit. 104.

⁶ K. Stade, *Der Politiker Diocletian* (Frankf. Diss. 1920), 109 f.; U. v. Wilamowitz, *D. Gl. d. Hellen.* 2, 519.

⁷ Th. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*³ 2, 706 n. 2; G. Wissowa, *RuKdR*² 94 n. 5; cp. Stade, op. cit. 112.

⁸ K. Stade, op. cit. 112, 114; U. v. Wilamowitz, op. cit. 2, 518 f.

⁹ *Rom und der Romgedanke* (1926).

¹⁰ Kaiser, *Rom und Renovatio. Studien Warburg* 17 (1929).

¹¹ F. Klingner, *Antike* 3, 17 f.

¹² A. Alföldi, op. cit. 26.

¹³ O. Seeck, in his edition of Symmachus: *MGH. auct. ant.* VI, 1, p. XVI f.; E. Stein, *Gesch. d. spätöm. Reiches* 1, 318 f.; A. Alföldi, op. cit. 37 n. 77.

¹⁴ Symmach., *rel.* 3, 9; cp. V. Schultze, *Gesch. d. Untergangs des griech.-röm. Heidentums* 1, 236.

¹⁵ F. Schneider, op. cit. 55 f.

¹⁶ A. Alföldi, op. cit. 26.

¹⁷ A. Alföldi, op. cit. 82.

¹⁸ We should not, however, underrate its power; for example, heathen ceremonies still appear in the calendar of Polemius Silvius of the year 449 (CIL. I, 1^a, p. 257 f.); see also F. Schneider, op. cit. 20 f.; A. Alföldi, op. cit. 30.

¹⁹ A. Alföldi, op. cit. 72 f.

²⁰ A. Alföldi, op. cit. 37.

²¹ F. Schneider, op. cit. 82 f.

²² We may recall here the words of Goethe about the advantages that 'are only to be reconciled with a pagan outlook' (in his *Biography* by Winckelmann, Section 'Heidnisches').

INDEX TO SUBJECTS

This index is intended to be illustrative, rather than exhaustive. Reference should also be made to the full Table of Contents, pp. ix ff. Latin words are included with the English, Greek are in a small separate alphabet at the end.

Abstractions, *see* Personifications

Aediles, curule, 282

After-life, 291 ff., 300 ff., 329 ff.

Age, Golden, *see* Golden Age

Alphabet, Etruscan, 264

Amor, 64

Ancestors, Roman respect for, 304 ff., 317, 367 ff., 379 ff., 388 ff.

Animal-form, Deities in, 78, 213 ff., 226, 247; *see also* under Bull, Horse, Wolf, &c.

Annales Maximæ, 198 f., 270 f.

Anthropomorphism, 227 ff.; *see also* Man as norm

Antiquarianism and religion, 382 ff.

Apotheosis, *see* Emperor-worship

Ara, Maxima, 245 f., 361; *Pacis*, 302, 378 f., 449

Archigallus, 314

Architecture, in Etruria, 224, 267 f.; in Greece, 24 f., 267 f.; in Malta, 22 f.; in Rome, 281 ff., 376, 451 ff.; in Sardinia, 24 f.; in S. Italy and Sicily, 224 ff.

Aristocracy, and religion, 146 ff., 276, 310 ff., 442 ff., 470 f.; *see also* *Gentes*

Art, in Campania, 88 ff.; in Etruria, 63, 92 f., 150 f.; in Greece, 27, 42 f., 45, 63; in early Italy, 18, 42 ff., 228; in Malta, 21 ff.; on Rock-sculptures, 29 ff.; in Rome of Empire, 375 ff., 448 ff.; in Sardinia, 25 ff.; relation to Poetry, 528

Asylum, right of, 255 ff., 518, 531

Augures (*augurium*), 199, 280 f., 380, 363

Augustus, meaning of word, 363 f.

Bucolic poetry, 341 ff.

Bull-god, 64 ff., 89 ff., 70 ff., 468, 490 — -man, 69 ff.

Calendar, Roman, 104 ff., 129 ff., 185 ff., 171 ff., 220, 243

Cardo, 183

Carmina sacularia, 288, 354, 382 ff., 394 ff., 458 ff.

Carmina Maeciana, 261

Castellieri culture, 86 f.

Castles, of nobles, 147 f., 480

Cemeteries, 35 f., 48 f., 93 ff., 101

Cena Sudaecadēis, 367

Cerritus, 121

Choirs, sacred, 288, 291 f., 394 ff., 458 f.

Chthonic cults, in Etruria, 68 ff., 117 f.; in Italy, 34 ff., 70 ff.; in Malta, 23; in Rome, 115 ff., 127, 132 f., 159 f., 163 f., 248 f., 255 ff., 262, 291 ff., 352 ff.; in Sardinia, 24, 27

Church and State, 3 f.; *see also* Politics

Circus Maximus, 237 f.

Civilization, of Etruria, 48, 47 ff., 100 ff.; of Greece, 220 ff.; of ancient Italy, 156 ff., 220 ff., 271 ff., 277 ff., 323 f.; of Malta, 21 f.; of ancient Mediterranean, 19 f.; of Rock-sculptures, 29 ff.; of Sardinia, 23 ff.

Classicism, 443 f.

Colleges, priestly, 380 ff., 384 ff.; *see also* under *Augures*, *Pontifices*, &c.

Colonies, Greek, in Italy, 86 ff.

Comitiare, 172 f.

Consecratio, *see* Emperor-worship

Constitutio Antoniniana, 456 f.

Cosmic ideas, applied to King, 176 ff.

Cremating peoples, cremation, 47 f., 93 ff., 136, 141

Cult, and poetry, 394 ff.; and politics, 423 f.; in Rome and Italy, 224 ff.; reception of Greek, in Rome, 248 ff.

Cult-image, 228 f., 247

Culture, *see* Civilization

Daps, 238

Dead, disposal of, 47 ff.; 97 ff.; worship of, 380 f.; *see also* *Di manes*

Decemviri sacris faciundis, *see* *Quindecimviri, II viri, X viri*

Deities, Etruscan, 114 ff., 144 ff.; Greek, 119 ff.; Homeric, 247 ff.; pre-Homeric, 127 ff.; as actual powers, 123 ff., 254 ff.; *see also* Reception of deities

Deity, Roman conception of, 181 ff., 229, 240

Demons, Etruscan, 49, 274

Destiny, of British Empire, 426 ff.; of Rome, 416 ff.

Devotio, 100 f., 121

- Di*, *advocarii*, 111 f.; *certi et incerti*, 885 f.; *indigenas*, 112 f.; *indigites*, 106 ff., 129, 142 f.; *manes*, 109, 121, 163 f.; *milichii*, 402 f., 405 ff.; *novensides* (-siles), 107 ff.; *praecipui et selecti*, 885; *proprii et communes*, 111; *publici*, 111 f.
- Dialects of Italy, 10 ff.; *see also* Language, Linguistics
- Dies*, *comitalis*, 105, 172 f.; *fasti*, 105; *intercalarii*, 105
- Divi*, 881, *see also* Emperor-worship
- Drama, Greek in Rome, 288 ff.; Italian, 157 ff.; *see Fabula Atellana*
- Dream of Ennius, 300 ff.
- Dynastic principle, 459 ff.
- Earth, deities of, 115 f., 120 ff., 127 ff., 169 ff., 187 ff., 248 ff., 255 ff., 394 ff.; Mother-, 47 f., 94 f., 97 ff., 117 f., 120 ff., 127 ff., 133, 187 ff., 248, 291
- Eastern religions in Rome, 309 ff., 328 ff., 350 ff., 434 ff., 454 ff., 466 ff.
- Elogium*, 95, 389
- Emancipation, and religion, 255 ff.
- Emperor, as God, 340 ff., 859 ff., 453, 467 f.
- worship, 300 f., 488 ff.
- Epic, Ionian, in Rome, 138 f., 297 ff.
- Epochs of history, 223, 327
- Epulum*, 288 f.
- Etymology and religion, 886
- Exemplum* (*exempla*), 379 ff., 380
- Extispicy, 50
- Fabula Atellana*, 157 ff., 279, 289
- Family, in Etruria, 59 ff.; in Rome, 59; *see also* *Gentes*
- Family-relationships of deities, 229, 239 f.
- Fanatici*, 315
- Fas*, 424
- Fasti*, 241, 461 ff., 514 f.
- Father-right, 51 ff., 59 f., 169
- Fatum*, 199, 270, 874, 886, 388, 391, 418 ff., 425 ff.
- Felix*, 427
- Female, contrasted with male, 21 f., 249, 404 ff.
- Feriae conceptivae*, 133 f.; *publicae*, 106, 129 ff.; *sementivae*, 134
- Festivals, 104 ff., 120 ff., 136 ff., 173 ff.
- Fire, deities of, 119 f., 150, 185, 204 ff.
- Flamen Dialis*, 331, 356
- Flamines*, 108, 187 ff., 281, 331
- Forum, 94 ff., 130, 233
- Augustum, 858; Julium, 358
- Fosse (ditch-graves), 57, 97, 161
- Freedmen (-women), 256 ff.
- Funeral plays, 158 f.
- Galli, 309 ff.
- Games, in honour of dead, 289; *see also* Gladiatorial games, *Ludi*
- Genius, in Etruria, 59 ff., 109; in Rome, 50, 189, 197
- Genius, of Emperor, 363; of Roman people, 467
- Gens*, *Gentes*, 18 f., 270, 467
- Gentile deities, 87, 101, 118 ff., 142, 144 ff., 184 f., 245, 277, 291, 357 f., 497, 502
- names, 101 f., 114 ff., 118, 142, 144 ff.
- Geography and history, 7 ff.
- Gladiatorial games, 48, 64, 266 f.
- God-man, 340 ff., 529; *see also* Emperor as god
- Gods, *see* Deities
- Golden Age, 338, 390; *see also* *Saeculum*
- Greatness of Rome, causes of, 411 ff.
- Grottoes, sacred, 226 f.
- Groves, sacred, 226 f.
- Harpuspices, 50
- Heavenly powers, 394 ff.
- Hell, 287, 332 ff.
- Helpers, Divine, 246 f.
- Heroes, 247
- Hiatus, in Greek relations with Italy, 272 ff., 827
- Hills of Rome, *see Monti*
- Hirpi Sorani*, 67, 212 f., 263
- History and religion, 3 f., 189 ff., 240 ff., 289, 388 f.
- Horse, as form of deity, 122, 160 f., 226, 509; olthonic, 481, 489; October, 98, 132, 138, 147, 160 f.
- House, as symbol of woman, 55 ff.; and Iguvine 'Tresas', 167 f.
- Humanitas*, 154 f.
- Hunts, ritual, 73 f.
- Ideologies, political, 412 ff.
- Immigrations, 18 f.
- Imperial family and religion, 851 ff., 438 ff., 459 ff.
- Religion, 433 ff.; *see also* Emperor
- Imperialism, 412 ff.
- Indigites*, *see* *Di*
- Individuality of Rome, 171 ff., 277 ff., 294 ff., 306 ff., 322 ff., 370 f., 435 ff.
- Individuals, great, *see* Personalities
- Inhumating peoples, inhumation, 47 f., 96 ff., 101
- Initiates, 269, 293 ff.
- Intermediaries, Italian, between Greece and Rome, 149 ff., 156 ff., 257, 264 f., 273 ff., 821
- Invocatio*, *generalis*, 110
- Ius Flavianum*, 261
- King, sacred functions of, 230; slaying of, 178 ff.
- Kingship in Rome, 171 ff., 242, 251
- Kings of Laurentum, 206 ff.; of Rome, 95 f., 170 ff.
- Language, evidence of, 5, 10 ff., 44 f., 836; *see also* Linguistics
- Larvas, 121
- Law and religion, 281, 838, 423 f., 518
- Lectisternium*, *Lectus*, 238 f., 284 f., 292, 367, 890

- Legend, Greek, in Etruria, 34 ff., 298 f.;
in Italy, 53
Libri, fatales, 72, 241 ff., 351, 359, 483
Light, gods of, 165 ff.
Lightning, gods of, 180
Linguistic study and religion, 5, 10 ff.,
44 f., 102 f., 112 f., 115, 189 f., 144,
154, 162 ff., 208 ff., 336, 475 ff.,
488 ff., 490, 501, 508
Literature, Roman, 32 f., 300 ff., 332 ff.,
389 ff., 377 ff., 394 ff.
Lucumones, 148
Ludi, 272 f.; *Apollinares*, 289, 353;
Cereales, 289; *Florales*, 289;
Magni, 237, 281 f.; *Megalenses*,
289 f., 310, 314; *Osci*, 272;
Plebeii, 289; *Romani*, 280; *Saecu-*
lares, 72, 237 ff., 291, 353 f., 382,
390, 394 ff., 442, 458 ff.; *Tarentini*,
287 ff.; *Tusci*, 72, 81; see also
Games
Ludiones, 158, 272 f.
Lusus talaris, 272
Luperai, 206 ff.
Maiores, see Ancestors
Male element contrasted with female,
22, 249, 404 ff.
Man, as norm of Greek art, 24 f., 27,
227 ff., 231; position of, in Etruria,
58 ff.; see also Bull-man, God-
man
Manumissio 256 f.
Masks, see *Oscilla*
Matriarchy, see Mother-right
Matron, Roman, 88
Mouth, course of, in cult, 171 ff.
Monti (hills) of Rome, 100 ff., 120 ff.,
136 ff., 147
Moon, and Diana, 398 ff.; in Roman
religion, 171 ff.
Moon-goddess, 165 f.
Mother-goddess, 126, 150; see also
Earth-mother
Motherhood, in Campania, 85 ff.; in
Illyria, 87 ff.
Mother-right, 50 ff., 59 f., 160, 487
Mundus, 120 f.
Muses, 302 f.
Mysteries, 269, 291 ff., 316 f.
Myth, Greek, 84 ff., 39; Roman,
200 ff., 240
Names, system of, 10, 102
Natural surroundings of early shrines,
226 ff.
Nature and spirit, 247
Nobility, see Aristocracy
Numa, 181, 187, 192 ff., 296, 364, 372,
375, 507 f.
Nymphs, 116 f., 121 f.
Obscenity, in cult, 129 f., 159
Oscilla, 120, 125 f., 159 f., 202, 498 f.,
508 f.
Pagan reaction in fourth century A.D.,
469 ff.
Pagani, 460
Pater familias, 415 f.; *patratus*, 423 f.
Pax deorum, 270
Peacock, symbol of eternity, 307
Peasant-religion, 146, 280, 322
Personal references in poets, 348 f.
Personalities, great, 312, 330 f., 425 ff.
Personifications, 167, 184 ff., 295 ff.,
438 f.
Phallus, 55 f., 58, 60 f., 86 ff., 159, 169
Philosophy and religion, 322 ff., 372 ff.
Pietas, 375
Pillar of Sky-god, 168
Plastic art, 224, 232 f.
Plebs and religion, 310 ff., 329 f.
Poetry and cult, 394 ff.
Poets and Emperor, 383 ff.; and
religion, 399 ff., 361, 372 ff., 377 ff.
Politics and religion, 252, 280
Pomerium, 244 f., 440 f., 456
Pontifex maximus, 198 f.; *Pontifices*,
230, 250, 270, 280 f., 381 f., 351, 356,
358, 467, 470, 522 n. 13
Porca, praecidanea, 120 f., 498; *prae-*
sentanea, 94, 97, 120, 408
Power, will to, 412 ff.
Poszi, 87, 95, 97
Pre-deistic religion, 500 f.
Princeps, see Emperor
Prodigium, 113, 197 ff., 270
Quindecimviri sacris faciundis, 380 f.,
351, 425, 470
Racial history, 8 ff.
Reception, of Etruscan deities in
Rome, 144 ff.; of Greek deities in
Rome and Italy, 123 ff., 149 ff.,
158 ff., 243 ff., 269 ff., 284 ff., 321,
327 f.; of Homeric deities, 147 ff.
Regia, 230 f.
Religio, 181, 270, 323, 332 f., 355, 375,
385, 420 f., 527, 530
Religion, Avestan, 369 ff.; Etruscan,
47 ff., 274 f.; Homeric, 41 f.,
127 ff., 378; pre-Homeric, 41, 60,
127 ff., 160 ff., 226
— types of, 378 f.
— and state, 467 ff.
Revival of religion under Augustus,
338 f., 350 ff., 437 ff.; see also
Law, Philosophy, Poetry
Rex Nemorensis, 178 ff.; *sacrificulus*
(*sacrorum*), 171 ff., 281, 508
Ritus graecus, 351
Rock-sculptures, 5, 29 ff., 74 f.
Runes, German, 273
Sacrifice, human, 178 ff., 280 f.
Saeculum, 176 f., 196 f., 287 f., 353 f.,
390, 459; see also *Ludi*
Saga, Greek, 34 f., 39
Sali, 441
Satura, 181
Seated posture, 257 ff., 478
Secular games, see *Ludi saeculares*
Sella, sellisternum, 238 f., 396, 404
Senarius, 255 f.

Senate and religion, 288 ff., 309 ff.
330 f., 442 ff., 459, 460 ff.

'Separate' gods, 182 ff.

Silenus, 115, 159

Silicernium, 95

Sky-god, 149 f., 184 ff.

Slaves, and asylum, 255 ff.; and Diana, 254

Society, organization of, 28 f.; *see also* Aristocracy, *Gentes*

Solar symbols, 76; *see also* Sun-worship

Sondergötter, *see* 'Separate' gods

Soothsayers, 311 ff.

Spirit and nature, 247

Spring, sacred (*ver sacrum*), 295

Springs, sacred, 226 f., 244

Stranger, and Diana, 254

— kingship of, 179, 211 ff.

Sun and Apollo, 396 ff.

— worship, 466 f.

Superstitio, 338, 527

Suppliants and asylum, 259 f., 517

Taciti manes, 115, 159

Temple, Capitoline, 281 ff.; *Capitolium vetus*, 131; of Mars *Ultr*, 385 f.

Temples, 228 ff., 267 ff.; at Cumae, 88; at Posidonia, 97 f.; early, in Italy, 267 f., 295 ff.; foundation of, 249 f., 322 ff.; restored by Augustus, 355, 385

— of Eastern deities in Rome, 450 ff.

Theatre, stone, 290 f.

Theophoric names, 497 n. 59

Tigillum sororium, 168, 176, 185

Time, conception of, 370 f.; *see also* Epochs

Totemism, 86

Tradition, Augustan respect for, 379 ff.

Transmigration of souls, 390 ff.

Tresviri epolones, 239

Triads; the Capitoline, 108, 281 ff., 289; Ceres, Liber, Libera, 268 f.; Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus, 138 f., 238; at Iguvium, 187

Triumph, Alban, 236; Roman, 181, 236 f., 241, 362, 424, 440 f.

Triumphal garb, 362, 366, 440 f., 506

Turris Mamiliæ, 68, 127 f.

Types of humanity, 414 f.

Tyrants, 224 f., 242

Vates, 381 ff., 438, 441, 533 n. 15

Venerari, 142 f.

Veraus quadratus, 158, 256, 272

Virgins, Vestal, 88 f., 141, 356

War, gods of, 138 ff.

Wolf, sacred, 68 f., 137, 206 ff., 226, 261 f.; symbol of outcast, 261

— she-, 187

Woman, position of, in Campania, 83 ff.; in Etruria, 60 ff., 58 ff., 81 ff.; in Rome, 88 f., 169 f.

Woodpecker, sacred, 66 f., 140, 226, 262

II Viri sacris faciundis, 241 ff.

X Viri sacris faciundis, 351

XV Viri sacris faciundis, *see* *Quindectviri*

GREEK

αισχρολογία, 123

εἶδος πολύγων, 27, 77 f

γενάρης, 111

δεικηλίκται, 158

κάτοχοι, 316

λίτρα, 14, 157

πάτρια θηρῶν, 151

συνοικισμός, of Rome, 100

INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

- Acca Larentia(n)a, 202, 261
 Achelous, 69 f.
 Acheruns, 287
 Aemili, 308
 Aeneas, 85, 89, 183, 206
 Aequi, 226
 Aesculapius, 288 f.
 Agonium, 185, 173
 Agrigentum, 125
 Agrios, 214 f.
 Aias, 53, 154, 247
 Αἴας, 14
 Aius Locutius, 113, 191 f.
 Alalia, 264
 Albanus mons, 235, 252
 Alexander, 284, 457 f.
 Alexander Severus, 461 ff.
 Alcibiades, 308
 Amma, 120
 Ancharia, 115
 Ancites, 113
 Angitia, Oscan *Anagitia*, 113, 391
 Anna Perenna, 108, 202
 Antium, calendar of, 105
 Aphrodite, 15, 34, 126, 383
 Apollo, 5, 35, 38 f., 53 f., 59 f., 237, 242, 248 f., 260 f., 262 f., 271, 277, 350-4, 359 f., 364, 365-8, 394-407, 439
 Aprilis, 126
 Apulia, Apull, 5, 21, 85, 38, 238, 278
 Ardea, 148, 211 f., 244 f.
 Argentina, 286
 Aricia, 292
 Armilustrium, 182
 Artemis, 41, 250 f., 352-4
 Arval Brethren, 158 f., 327, 350, 439 f., 441 f., 464
 Atellana, 64, 157 f., 272, 279, 289
 Attis, 310
 Augustus, 850 ff.
 Aurelii, 129, 146
 Aventinus, 260, 268
 Bacchanalia, 298 f., 310 f., 314 f., 316, 325, 447 f.
 Bologna, 70 f., 98, 180, 231, 365
 Cacus, 204 f.
 Caeculus, 204 f.
 Caele Vibenna, 102
 Caelius, 101 f.
 Caere, 5, 43, 48 f., 55 f., 70, 180, 232, 237, 264, 287
 — Jomba Regolini-Galassi, 42, 82, 151
 Caesar, Divus Julius, 263, 355, 364
 Calchas, 35
 Callinachus, prelude to the *Αἴα*, 300 f.
 Camilla, 160, 228
 Campania, Campanians, 81, 83-8, 149 f., 203, 241, 246, 255, 269, 274, 293, 311, 318, 329
 Camunni, 81 f.
 Capitolium, 94, 129 f., 171 f., 232-42, 251 f., 258-65, 295, 352, 358 f.
 Capitolium vetus, 130 f.
 Capus, 84 f., 268
 Caracalla, 456 f., 459
 Carmenta, 134
 Castellieri, 40, 86 f.
 Ceres, 97 f., 120 f., 133, 150, 186-9, 226, 234, 268-70, 292 f., 316
 Chaldaei, 311, 314
 Chiuri, sarcophagus, 160, 232
 Ciccero, 305, 337 f., 373 f., 422
 Cirec, 34, 214, 298, 512 n. 97
 Clitumnus, 237
 Cloaca Maxima, 233
 Collatina, 145
 Commodus, 453 f.
 Concordia, 282, 296
 Consus, 183 f., 137, 185 f., 196 f., 237
 Corinthian pottery, 30, 32, 42 f., 151
 Cumae, 38 f., 42 f., 241 f., 289, 293, 352
 Cyrene, sacred law, 259 f.
 Damia, **Damosia*, 84 f., 268
 Dauna, 212, 216
 Daunus, 67, 210-14, 216
 Dea Dia, 166, 440
dea Syria, 312, 446
Deferunda Commolenda Coinquenda Adolenda, 188 f.
 Delphi, 258-66, 272, 307 f.
 Demaratus, 43, 151, 251
 Demeter, 37 f., 120-5, 169 f.
 Δημήτριος, 96
 Diana, 166, 178, 250 f., 252 f., 354, 394-407
 Digidii, 120
 Dioeletian, 467
 Diomedes, 35, 210 f., 214
 Dionysos, 40, 51, 62, 83, 125 f., 149 f., 159 f., 202, 293 f., 311, 316, 359, 367, 391, 453, 534 n. 40
 Dioscuri, 40, 87 f., 206, 239, 248-5, 246, 268, 277
diumpats, Oscan, 122, 187
 Dius Fidius, 164 ff.
 Diva Augurona, 114 f., 133
 Diva Palatua, 469 n. 22

Divus, 360 f.

Dolichenum on the Aventine, 454

Duronia, 523 n. 34

Edula, Edusa, 145

Elagabalus, 458

Elba, 119, 120

Ennius, 300-8, 390 f.

Epicharmos, 158, 308

Epicureans, 332 f.

Equirria, 132, 174

Equus Maximus, 451

Equus October, 68 f., 182, 136, 147, 149, 161

Eryx, 15

Esquiliae, *Esquilinus*, 97, 101, 149

Etruria, Etruscans, 5, 16 f., 18, 30, 42 f., 46-64, 68 f., 73 f., 78 f., 81-3, 85 f., 100-3, 114-18, 144-54, 162 f., 203, 224 f., 232-42, 244 f., 268 f., 267 f., 272-6, 294, 321

Etrusca disciplina, 150

Euganeans, 32 f.

Eumenides, 59 f., 117

* *Euklos pater*, 292

Extraterramariccoli, 18, 98

Fabii, 137, 144

Falacer, 126

Falerii, Faliscans, 10 f., 69, 122, 150, 153, 226, 232, 284 f., 250, 253

Fatuus, 391, 482 n. 170

Fauna, 212

Faunus, 136 f., 206-17, 226 f., 261

Favonius, 208

Februus, 182

Feronia, 53, 144, 255, 262

* *Fisos*, Oscan and Umbrian, 164-6

Flusaratis, Oscan, 186

Flora, Floralia, 122 f., 139, 187 f.

Fontinalia, 132

Fordicidia, 133

Fortuna, 190 f., 268, 361, 532 n. 2

Fortuna huius diei, 190 f.

fufturns, Etruscan, 151 f.

Furiac, 117

Furrina, Furrinalia, 116-18, 133

Genius, *see* Index to Subjects

Gorgasos and Damophilos, 284, 269

* *Grabovios*, 163

Hadrian, 446, 452

Hephaistos, 119 f., 150, 152 f.

Hercules, 144, 204 f., 212, 285, 245-7, 277, 281, 292, 453, 467

* *Herulus*, 58, 144

Hirpini, 68 f., 212 f.

Homeric deities, 127 f., 227 f., 247-55

Hora, 184

Horace, 334, 889, 854, 362, 365, 372, 377-93, 394-407, 419-22, 531 n. 24

Horatii, 146, 184 f.

Iambe, 123

Ianus, 102, 135, 135, 186, 162, 194 f., 424

Idus, 104, 166 f.

Iguvium, 10, 73, 163, 168 f., 167 f., 195, 220, 277

Ilithyia, 395 f., 400, 403 f.

Illyrians, 5, 13 f., 89 f., 86-8, 153 f., 209-14, 216 f., 275, 279

Indo-Germans, 9 f., 20, 65, 79 f., 142 f.

Isis, 311, 329, 446 f.

Isola Sacra, 458 f.

Italia, 64-8, 80

Italy, Italians, 7 f., 34, 64 f., 79 f., 120 f., 156-70, 228-8, 271-85, 328 f.

Jews, 155, 311, 317, 447

Junius mensis, 16, 162 f.

Juno, 108 f., 162 f., 235 f., 240, 255, 265 f., 268, 282, 354, 395-404, 439, 461

Jupiter, 106, 110, 113, 126, 143, 164-8, 185, 195 f., 232-42, 255, 265 f., 268, 282, 354, 358 f., 362, 364, 366, 395-403, 424, 427, 439, 461, 467

Jupiter Sabazius, 311, 317

Juturna, 206, 243-5

Lanuvium, 56

Lares, *mater Larum*, 109 f., 133, 159, 288, 334, 363

Latium, Latins, 10 f., 44 f., 101, 140, 178-80, 236, 246, 252, 267, 430, 454, 459

lauxanneti, Etruscan, 148

Lavinium, 113, 141, 148

Lemnos, 152 f.

Lemuria, 183

Leptis Magna, 460 f.

Liber, Liberalia, 125 f., 149 f., 159 f., 202, 268-70

Liganakthkei, Oscan, 128

Ligurians, 5, 83, 74, 228

Livius Andronicus, 288, 297 f., 382

Locri Epizephyrii, 57 f.

Lucaria, 133

Lucoris, 260 f.

Lucretius, 825, 382-4, 873

Lupercalia, 182, 136

Lupercus, 67, 137, 207, 218 f.

Lykoreus, 260 f.

Ma, 315

maathis kerriiuis, Oscan, 98, 163, 186, 187

Maia, 133, 185

Maius, 126, 185

Malta, 21 f., 25, 87 f.

Mamers, 189 f., 165

Μάμπερα, 186

Mamertini, 140

Mamilli, 68, 81, 147 f.

Manamatapa, 177 f.

Manes, 109 f., 115, 117 f., 133, 168 f., 361

Mania, 117 f., 138, 159, 163

Manturna, 118, 164

Mantus, 102, 118, 164

Marcus Aurelius, 453

Marius, 314

Marmar, 139 f.

Mars, 188-40, 153, 161, 165, 180, 195,
226, 238, 261, 262, 295, 359, 385 f.,
439
Marsi, 111, 140
Marzabotto, 234, 235
Mestarna, 16, 102
Mater Magna, 290, 309 f., 314 f., 383
Mater Matuta, 51, 120, 234, 265, 267 f.
Matrons, 453
Mavors, 139
Melinno, 527 n. 7
Mens, 295 f.
Mercurius, 146, 250 f., 253 f., 266, 365
Messapians, 18 f.
Messapus, Metabus, 40, 160, 226, 278 f.,
304
Metamorphoses, 511 n. 90
Minerva, 233 f., 239, 250 f., 253 f.,
265 f., 439
Monteleone, 149, 151
Muses, 391-3
Mutinus Titinus, 61

Nuxos, 152 f.
Neptunus, Neptunalia, 126
Nigidius Figulus, 308, 329
Nonae, 104, 108, 171 f., 178, 180
Novilara, 5, 29 f., 32, 228
*Novillianus, 498 n. 84
Numa the Pythagorean, 308, 310
Numantia, 77
Numisius Martius (Mars), 145
Numiternus, 145
Nuraghe, 24 f., 28

Odysseus, 34, 30, 68, 128, 154, 214, 210,
297 f.
Ogulnius, Q., 280 f.
Olympia, 62
Ops, 183 f., 185 f., 190
Orci nuptiae, 292 f.
Oscans, 5, 10 f., 188, 150, 157 f.,
163-8 pass., 272, 278 f., 391

Pacligni, 153
Paestum, 37 f., 68, 150, 224, 275, 295
Palatinus, Palatium, 93 f., 102 f., 186 f.,
147, 235, 245, 309, 351, 359,
366
Pales, 108, 186
Panda Cela, 120
Parentalia, 95, 132
Parilia, 103
Phersu, Etruscan deity, 158
Phlyaces, 158, 279
Piacenza, bronze liver of, 50
Picenum, Picentines, 10, 29 f., 67, 75 f.,
141, 149, 226
Picus, 67, 140, 226, 262
Pinarii, 146, 245, 281
Polouces, 18
Poplifugium, 174
Populonia, 5, 151 f.
Portunus, 135
Procidon, 37 f., 40, 71, 126, 160, 162,
169 f.
Potina, 145
Potitii, 146, 245, 281

Praeneste, 53, 111, 180, 204 f., 287 f.
— Fibula of, 44 f., 102
— Tomba Barberini, 42, 101, 151
— Tomba Bernardini, 42, 101, 151
Prima porta, statue of Augustus, 398 f.
Proserpina, 262, 287 f., 291 f.
púmpériais, Oscan, 164 f.
Pythagoreans, 279, 302-8, 320

Quinquatrus, 132, 185
Quirinal, 96 f., 129 f., 137-43 pass.,
456 f.
Quirinus, 129, 138, 282

Regia, 230 f.
Refugium, 173-81
Robigus, Robigalia, 133
Roma, origin of the name, 137, 146 f.
— deity, 325, 360, 452, 468 f.
Rome, idea of, 467-72
Romulus, 95 f., 137, 174, 206, 258 f.,
430
Rumina, *ficus Ruminalis*, Roman, 137
Rusina, 145

Sabelli, 10 f., 96, 138, 150
Sabini, 96-101, 129, 187 f., 226, 258
Salacia, 184
Salii, 138, 173, 177, 281, 361, 449
Samnium, Samnites, 10, 66, 74, 80, 122,
138, 150, 268, 272, 275, 278 f., 292,
308, 391
Saneus, 102, 143
Sardinia, 5, 15, 20, 28-9, 70, 70-9
Sassanida, 462, 464 f.
Saticum, 69, 231, 234, 265, 267 f.
Saturnian metre, 161
Saturnus, 114, 126
Scipiones, 305 f., 427 f., 431
Septimius Severus, 442, 448, 468-61, 463
Septimontium, 100 ff., 129 f.
Serapis, 311, 315, 329, 456 f.
Servius Tullius, 102, 206
Sesians, Etruscan, 119, 152 f.
Sibyl, 38 f., 351 f.
Sibylline books, 72, 199, 241 f., 243,
246, 269 f., 283, 295, 309, 351, 359,
397 f.
Sicily, Sicels, 14 f., 21, 35, 36, 69, 125,
150, 159, 224
Signia, 234, 235
Silarus, temple of Argive Hera, 37, 43 f.
Sol, 394-407, 468 f.
Sol Indiges, 109, 113, 129
Soranus pater, 212 f., 263, 352
Sorrento, base, 351, 357
Stoa, 334-7, 374
Subura, 38, 100, 147
Sulla, 311, 331, 426 f.

Tacitus, 425
Tanaquil, 51
Tarquinians, 72, 180 f., 146, 151, 225,
282-42, 251, 263 f., 268
Tarquinii, 42, 82 f., 151, 294
— Bokchoris tomb, 42, 151
— Tomba dei tori, 69
— Tomba del guerriero, 42, 97

- Tarquinii, Tomba del letto funebre, 239
 — Tomba del trichinio, 62
 — Tomba dell' Orco, 298
 — Tomba della caccia, 160
 — Tomba delle leonesse, 82 f.
 — Tomba Stackelberg, 62, 287
 Tattius, Titus, 137 f.
Tellus Terrasque pater, 168
 Tellus, 121 f., 133, 161, 292, 376 f., 395 f.
 Terminus, Terminalia, 175 f., 197
 Terracina, 227, 235, 255 f.
 Terramare, 18
 Trajan, 439, 452
 Trebenische, 32, 40 f.
 **Trebes*, Oscan, 102 f., 167 f.
 Tubilustrium, 133, 173 f., 177
 Tyrrhenians, 152 f.

Ulixes, 128, 154, 216, 299
 Umbria, Umbrians, 5, 10 f., 73 f., 153, 164 f., 167 f., 226, 277
 Val Camonica, 81 f., 75
 Vallonia, 145
 Varro, 385-7
 Veii, 5, 69, 144, 232, 234, 236, 237, 248, 282, 353
 Veiovis, 132, 202 f., 353
 Velia, 94, 147
 Venetians, 5, 13 f., 30, 228
 Venus, 142 f., 338, 358
 Vesta, Vestal Virgins, 88 f., 140-3, 230, 356 f., 467
 Vestini, 188, 141 f.
 Vetulonia, 42, 232
 — Tomba del duce, 42, 97
 — Tomba di petriera, 151
 Victoria, 285, 296, 309
 Villa Item, Pompeii, 298 f., 376
 Villanova, 18, 44, 70, 94, 161, 180, 228, 231
 Vinalia, 133, 187
 Virbius, 509 n. 9
 Virgil, 305 f., 334, 339-49, 350, 354, 372, 374, 387 f., 403, 416-19
 Volca, 114, 234 f.
 Vulcanus, 95, 101, 114, 119 f., 133, 150, 173, 204
 Voltarnus, 114
 Vulci, 151, 232
 — Tomba François, 102

BERSERKER

BOOKS

